

RECEIVED

00 JUN -9 PM 3:48

WORKSHOP

PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
LEGAL DIVISION

PROJ. NOS. 20400 & 22165

PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 2000

KENNEDY REPORTING SERVICE, INC.

(512)474-2233

KENNEDY
REPORTING
SERVICE

a record of excellence

800 Brazos • Suite 340 • Austin, Texas 78701 • 512-474-2233

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF TEXAS
AUSTIN, TEXAS

SECTION 271 COMPLIANCE) PROJECT NO.
MONITORING OF SOUTHWESTERN BELL) 20400
TELEPHONE COMPANY OF TEXAS)

IMPLEMENTATION OF DOCKET NOS.) PROJECT NO.
20226 AND 20272) 22165

WORKSHOP
THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 2000

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT AT 9:36 a.m., on

Thursday, the 8th day of June 2000, the
above-entitled matter came on for hearing at the
Public Utility Commission of Texas, 1701 North
Congress Avenue, Austin, Texas 78701, before
DONNA NELSON, NARA SRINIVASA & JENNIFER FAGAN;
and the following proceedings were reported by
Steven Stogel and Lou Ray, Certified Shorthand
Reporters of:

1 Srinivasa, TIA staff of the ORA division.
2 MS. FAGAN: Jennifer Fagan, legal
3 division, ORA.
4 MS. ZAKE: I'm Diana Zake. I'm
5 with OPD.
6 MR. SRINIVASA: I need to add
7 something. If you are able to finish all of
8 those PM -- the major areas that Donna just
9 described, if we have time, we may take up
10 clarifying language in the performance remedy
11 plan, Attachment 17. This is calculation
12 methodology for Tier 2 assessments. You know,
13 there is some ambiguity between percent and
14 averages. We want to clarify that.
15 MS. NELSON: Okay. Let's start
16 off by having all the subject matter experts who
17 will be participating today identify themselves,
18 and then we'll have the attorneys make their
19 appearances on the record. Mr. Dysart.
20 MR. DYSART: Randy Dysart,
21 Southwestern Bell.
22 MS. FETTIG: Eva Fettig, AT&T.
23 MR. SAUDER: T.J. Sauder, Birch
24 Telecom.
25 MS. MCCALL: Cindy McCall,

PROCEEDINGS
THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 2000
(9:36 a.m.)

1 MS. NELSON: Okay. Let's go on
2 the record in Project No. 20400, Section 271,
3 compliance monitoring of Southwestern Bell
4 Telephone Company of Texas, Project No. 22165,
5 implementation of Docket Nos. 20226 and 20272.
6 This is a workshop to address
7 performance measurements. Today we're going to
8 be discussing ones relating to -- first we're
9 going to have a continuation of the ones that
10 were considered at the June 6th workshop,
11 including change management billing, trunking,
12 and collocation. Actually, two of those have
13 not been considered at all. And then we'll move
14 on to ones that have been noticed for today,
15 which include wholesale support, LNP, NXX,
16 directory assistance and OS, LIDB, 911, the BFR
17 process, and general overview measures and
18 comments.
19 My name is Donna Nelson, and I'm going
20 to let the other Commission staff introduce
21 themselves.
22 MR. SRINIVASA: My name is Nara

1 WorldCom.
2 MS. EMCH: Marsha Emch, WorldCom.
3 MS. KNIGHT: Patricia Knight, Time
4 Warner Telecom.
5 MS. NELSON: Okay. Are there
6 other subject matter experts who intend to make
7 appearances today?
8 MR. COWLISHAW: Yes. I may. Pat
9 Cowlishaw, AT&T.
10 MS. SAEVA: Gina Saieva, SBC
11 Services.
12 MS. SOLIS: Cindy Solis from
13 Rhythms.
14 MR. SIEGEL: Howard Siegel, IP
15 Communications.
16 MR. KITE: Jim Kite with Sprint
17 Corporation.
18 MR. LOCUS: John Locus,
19 Southwestern Bell.
20 MS. DILLARD: Maria Dillard,
21 Southwestern Bell.
22 MS. NELSON: Okay. At a break
23 this morning, if you wouldn't mind giving the
24 court reporter a copy of a card or spell your
25 name for him, I'm sure he would appreciate it.

Page 5	Page 7
<p>1 Now, let's take appearances of attorneys.</p> <p>2 MS. MALONE: Cynthia Malone,</p> <p>3 Southwestern Bell.</p> <p>4 MS. BOURIANOFF: Michelle</p> <p>5 Bourianoff, AT&T.</p> <p>6 MR. WAKEFIELD: Good morning, Your</p> <p>7 Honor. Jason Wakefield on behalf of WorldCom.</p> <p>8 MR. DRUMMOND: Eric Drummond on</p> <p>9 behalf of the CLEC Coalition.</p> <p>10 MS. NELSON: Okay. I think we</p> <p>11 would like to start out by having the parties</p> <p>12 report on any agreements that have been made in</p> <p>13 the areas of change management and collocation</p> <p>14 since the last meeting.</p> <p>15 MR. DYSART: Randy Dysart,</p> <p>16 Southwestern Bell. As far as change management,</p> <p>17 we presented yesterday our proposal to the</p> <p>18 CLECs, and they were going to take that back and</p> <p>19 evaluate that yesterday -- or last night. And</p> <p>20 as far as collocation, I thought we had reached</p> <p>21 agreement on collocation.</p> <p>22 MR. SRINIVASA: Three -- five</p> <p>23 days?</p> <p>24 MR. DYSART: Right, with the</p> <p>25 exception of the three and five and -- I know</p>	<p>1 MS. NELSON: Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>2 MS. BOURIANOFF: Randy, I know you</p> <p>3 presented Southwestern Bell's proposal on the</p> <p>4 change management measure last night -- or</p> <p>5 yesterday based on our discussions yesterday</p> <p>6 afternoon. I thought you were going to take</p> <p>7 back the possibility of relooking at the</p> <p>8 exclusions and the concerns we talked about.</p> <p>9 MS. DILLARD: Yes. This is Maria</p> <p>10 Dillard, Southwestern Bell. We were looking at</p> <p>11 that. We just had a request from the CLECs last</p> <p>12 evening, and so I have some folks helping me</p> <p>13 look at that. Could we look at that perhaps</p> <p>14 this afternoon?</p> <p>15 MS. NELSON: That would be fine.</p> <p>16 MS. DILLARD: Okay.</p> <p>17 MS. NELSON: Okay. Let's move</p> <p>18 ahead to the -- go ahead.</p> <p>19 MR. SRINIVASA: Excuse me. MCI</p> <p>20 also had proposed two measures related to change</p> <p>21 management, and the second one you said you were</p> <p>22 going to take a look at that and you may want to</p> <p>23 discuss -- and you said you were going to</p> <p>24 discuss that with MCI to see if there is room to</p> <p>25 negotiate and come up with a compromise. Have</p>
Page 6	Page 8
<p>1 Time Warner in particular was going to check</p> <p>2 about the three and five.</p> <p>3 MR. SRINIVASA: That's what I</p> <p>4 wanted to --</p> <p>5 MR. DYSART: Okay.</p> <p>6 MS. KNIGHT: Right. When speaking</p> <p>7 with my operations folks, five days is what we</p> <p>8 would like. Is that acceptable?</p> <p>9 MR. DYSART: Obviously we'd like</p> <p>10 three, but I think probably we can live with</p> <p>11 five.</p> <p>12 MS. KNIGHT: Okay.</p> <p>13 MR. SRINIVASA: So five days. Is</p> <p>14 that acceptable with other CLECs?</p> <p>15 (No response)</p> <p>16 MS. NELSON: Okay. Would you --</p> <p>17 MS. BOURIANOFF: I'm sorry, Your</p> <p>18 Honor. This isn't with regard to the three or</p> <p>19 five days. It was with regard to the change</p> <p>20 management measure.</p> <p>21 MS. NELSON: Before we move on,</p> <p>22 let's just say in collocation does anyone oppose</p> <p>23 the five days that Time Warner set out and</p> <p>24 Southwestern Bell agreed to?</p> <p>25 (No response)</p>	<p>1 you done that?</p> <p>2 MR. DYSART: This is Randy Dysart,</p> <p>3 Southwestern Bell. We presented two</p> <p>4 measurements; one addressing the timeliness</p> <p>5 issue that both AT&T and WorldCom presented,</p> <p>6 and then we addressed one issue as far as how</p> <p>7 long it takes to correct a problem after the</p> <p>8 software has been, I guess, released. We</p> <p>9 presented a proposal on that and also discussed</p> <p>10 with MCI our concerns about the other piece of</p> <p>11 that measurement, which is the testing. And I</p> <p>12 don't think we're agreeable to that piece of the</p> <p>13 measurement. So we addressed those issues with</p> <p>14 MCI.</p> <p>15 MR. SRINIVASA: Have you --</p> <p>16 MS. EMCH: This is Marsha Emch</p> <p>17 with WorldCom. What we decided to do is to work</p> <p>18 within the two measures that Southwestern Bell</p> <p>19 is agreeable to doing, and on the call yesterday</p> <p>20 we presented an overview of these -- our issues</p> <p>21 and concerns and we'd get back to our SMEs to</p> <p>22 see if there's any more. And we're just -- same</p> <p>23 as Southwestern Bell. We just found out last</p> <p>24 night, so we're hoping to hear from them this</p> <p>25 afternoon. But we did address at least our five</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 9</p> <p>1 or six initial issues we had with Southwestern 2 Bell's proposal on both measures. 3 MS. NELSON: Okay. So we can take 4 that up later this afternoon also. Okay. So 5 let's move to the trunking measures, which I 6 guess start at No. 70. 7 MR. SRINIVASA: Yeah. 8 MS. NELSON: And could you start, 9 Mr. Dysart, by just describing where you have 10 agreement with the parties? 11 MR. DYSART: This is Randy 12 Dysart, Southwestern Bell. If it's okay, I may 13 try to address the issues that we specifically 14 had on there as areas of disagreement. And I 15 think we had some additional proposals that may 16 eliminate at least some of those. 17 MS. NELSON: Okay. 18 MR. DYSART: Time Warner had 19 recommended gathering data for block calls of 20 20 days. 21 MS. NELSON: And you're referring 22 to PM 70 right now? 23 MR. DYSART: 70, correct. 24 MS. NELSON: Okay. 25 MR. DYSART: And MCI recommended</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 11</p> <p>1 MR. SRINIVASA: Does AT&T have a 2 comment on that? 3 MR. COWLISHAW: What's the gain 4 we're getting -- I'm sorry -- for waiting? 5 MR. DYSART: Well, the gain -- 6 Randy Dysart, Southwestern Bell -- is that -- 7 you know, we had the issue about a study week, 8 and now we're taking the entire month of data. 9 That's the gain, basically. 10 MS. NELSON: There had been 11 concern articulated by various parties that the 12 study didn't include enough time to be an 13 accurate reflection of trunk blockage. 14 MS. FETTIG: This is Eva Fettig 15 from AT&T. That's acceptable to us. 16 MR. SRINIVASA: So just for PM 70, 17 you're not going to post that on the Web site on 18 the 20th. It's going to be at the end of the 19 month, or is it just the block call information? 20 MR. DYSART: For right now, it 21 would just be PM 70 will be delayed. 22 MS. NELSON: Okay. Can you -- has 23 anyone prepared language that would modify the 24 performance measure? 25 MR. SRINIVASA: In PRP there's</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 10</p> <p>1 the entire month. We are willing to do a 2 measurement that incorporates the 20 business 3 days, as Time Warner had suggested at our 4 previous meeting, with one caveat. If we do 5 that, that will include the entire month of 6 data, but like June -- it will all be June data. 7 So we're not involved in the study week issue 8 that we had talked before, I think. But what 9 that will force us to do is delay the reporting 10 of that measurement not to the 20th but by the 11 end of the month. There's a time constraint -- 12 by the time we get the data, the reports are 13 run. It takes about a week. By the time they 14 receive it, it's another week. And then they 15 have to validate that data. So it takes some 16 additional time. And so I think if we could get 17 agreement that for this particular measurement 18 instead of reporting on the 20th of the month, 19 if we could report by the 1st of the following 20 month, we would be acceptable in doing this. 21 MS. KNIGHT: That's acceptable to 22 Time Warner. 23 MS. McCALL: Cindy McCall, 24 WorldCom. That's acceptable to WorldCom as 25 well.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 12</p> <p>1 a -- 2 MR. DYSART: Well, I think the 3 business rules would have to change. And the 4 block calls and total calls are gathered on a 5 monthly basis, and then it excludes weekends and 6 holidays. We're at business days now. I don't 7 have official language, but we would do that and 8 then provide that. Our plan was, after Friday, 9 to go ahead and get all the language and then 10 send it out to everybody like on Monday or 11 Tuesday. 12 MS. NELSON: Okay. 13 MR. DYSART: If that's all right. 14 The second issue was disaggregation for one way. 15 And I think our notes are a little cryptic. As 16 I recall, this was about 911 trunks and OS/DA 17 trunks. 18 MS. KNIGHT: Unfortunately, I'm 19 not familiar with that, so I don't know about 20 the answer to that one. I can check on that 21 during the break, though. 22 MR. DYSART: Okay. Well, I'll 23 give you the answer to what we think the 24 question is. If that's not the right 25 question --</p>

Page 13

1 MS. KNIGHT: Yeah. I wasn't
2 briefed on that one.
3 MR. DYSART: We are not agreeable
4 to providing information on 911, DA, those type
5 of trunks for a couple of reasons. First of
6 all, that is really one way from the CLEC into
7 our tandem, which they're into control of
8 that -- servicing of that trunk group.
9 Secondly, we don't get the peg count on that.
10 We just get -- I think we send TDSR out based on
11 usage information that we get. So we really
12 don't have the information to do that. This is
13 also going to be covered in other measurements
14 like if you need additional trunks, we've got
15 missed due dates. We've got other measurements
16 that we're going to go ahead and incorporate
17 those in in some other measurements that will
18 account for our ability to provide you these
19 trunks in a timely manner. So I don't think
20 it's appropriate in PM 70.
21 MR. SRINIVASA: So, in PM 70, even
22 if it's two-way trunk, your switch captures the
23 originating call and --
24 MR. DYSART: Two-way trunks are no
25 problem.

Page 14

1 MR. SRINIVASA: So you're
2 capturing both the originating and the
3 terminating call? What you're reporting in here
4 for blockage information, is it --
5 MS. SAIEVA: Yes. On two-way
6 trunk groups, we capture the peg counts -- well,
7 we capture the pegs on the originating end -- on
8 the originating end only. We only have the
9 ability to capture on originating peg count, but
10 we can capture block calls on both ends.
11 MR. SRINIVASA: So you do capture
12 block calls -- how do you know if a call is
13 originating from a CLEC's network -- it's coming
14 from the CLEC's switch -- and, of course, they
15 do have a peg count at their switch.
16 MS. SAIEVA: Right.
17 MR. SRINIVASA: And apparently
18 it's coming towards you. If they do not have
19 adequate number of trunks, if it gets blocked at
20 their switch, how do you know that?
21 MS. SAIEVA: We see it as
22 overflow. It counts as an overflow.
23 MR. SRINIVASA: To the extent they
24 are connected to the end office and to the
25 tandem, if it drops through tandem, you will see

Page 15

1 that as an overflow. But if they're connected
2 only at the tandem --
3 MS. SAIEVA: If they're connected
4 at the tandem -- it's called an overflow, but
5 when you're connected at the tandem, which is a
6 final route, it's shown as an overflow, but it's
7 a blocked call, and it's identified there. The
8 name of it is called overflow, but it is a
9 blocked call. It's pegged as a blocked call.
10 So we do see blocked calls at the tandem, as
11 well at the end office we see overflow.
12 MR. SRINIVASA: Let me understand.
13 CLECs have a certain number of customers who are
14 trying to call your customers that are served
15 off of your switch. But the CLEC's switch is
16 interconnected only at the tandem. They do not
17 have an end office connection. They are
18 subtending tandem. Now, the CLEC's customers
19 try to call, and apparently if you do not have
20 adequate number of trunks coming from the CLEC
21 site, you -- CLEC switch to your switch, the
22 call gets blocked, because it doesn't even hit
23 the trunk.
24 MS. SAIEVA: Right.
25 MR. SRINIVASA: How does tandem

Page 16

1 recognize that? The CLEC knows there's a peg
2 count. The calls came into that switch. It
3 didn't even make it to the trunk.
4 MS. SAIEVA: We have a data
5 collection device system that actually picks
6 that up -- if the call is coming through, it
7 does identify that the call was blocked and it
8 could not be completed. And it's set up in our
9 data collection device -- the way it's set up,
10 it says, "Peg count overflow usage and
11 maintenance." So while it's called overflow,
12 it's pretty much a generic term. If it's a
13 final route, it's a blocked call. If it's a
14 high usage, a trunk group that would overflow,
15 it would be a call that overflowed.
16 MR. SRINIVASA: So you do measure
17 peg counts -- you have a data feed for peg
18 counts from a CLEC switch, somebody to capture
19 that onto trunks?
20 MS. SAIEVA: We cannot measure the
21 peg, because the peg is on the CLEC switch. But
22 we can measure the usage coming in, as well
23 as -- if the call does not complete at our
24 switch, we can measure the overflow -- the
25 blocked call. Excuse me. We measure that as a

Page 17

Page 19

1 blocked call.
2 MS. KNIGHT: This is Time Warner,
3 Patricia Knight. I have a clarifying question.
4 You have this bucket that's called overflow,
5 and what goes in there -- if you have an end
6 office trunk room and it overflows to the
7 tandem, are those shown there?
8 MS. SAEVA: Correct. They're
9 shown there.
10 MS. KNIGHT: Okay. In addition,
11 if you only have tandem trunks and it's a final
12 route, those are shown in that bucket as well?
13 MS. SAEVA: Correct.
14 MS. KNIGHT: Okay. Do you have
15 the ability to identify which is which?
16 MS. SAEVA: Well, the ability is
17 that if it's a final route, we know that that's
18 a blocked call.
19 MS. KNIGHT: Okay. And there's
20 something in that bucket that delineates that
21 from an end office?
22 MS. SAEVA: Right. If it's a
23 final route, well, the generic term may be
24 overflow. We know that's a blocked call because
25 it is a final route. If it's a high usage trunk

1 MR. SRINIVASA: Right. Okay.
2 That's what I wanted to clarify.
3 MS. MICHAELS: Teresa Michaels,
4 Southwestern Bell.
5 MR. COWLISHAW: It sounds like
6 the -- that they're internally either able to or
7 are capturing blocked calls on the incoming
8 traffic. That was what I got from that last
9 discussion.
10 MR. DYSART: I think what I
11 got is -- Randy Dysart, Southwestern Bell -- is
12 we capture the blocked calls, but we can't get
13 the peg count of your originations from the
14 two-way group. We get the originations from our
15 end.
16 MR. COWLISHAW: But you sounded
17 like there was -- calls attempted versus calls
18 completed was something that was in fact
19 available to you on incoming.
20 MS. SAEVA: The calls completed
21 would be calculated in the usage on a trunk
22 group, which is somewhat different than this,
23 because here we're talking total -- number of
24 calls versus blocked calls. So a -- the offer
25 load on a trunk group would tell us how many of

Page 18

Page 20

1 group, we know that it's overflowing. So it's
2 overflowing to the alternate route, which is the
3 tandem.
4 MR. SRINIVASA: But they're
5 subtending tandem. They don't have any other
6 route.
7 MS. SAEVA: Are you --
8 MR. SRINIVASA: If they are
9 subtending tandem, they do not have any trunks
10 to the end office --
11 MS. SAEVA: Okay. If there is a
12 trunk group that is directly just to the tandem
13 and there are no end offices, it's a final
14 route, and that would be a blocked call.
15 MR. SRINIVASA: Okay. In
16 reporting PM 70, you have a disaggregation, CLEC
17 end office to Southwestern Bell end office, and
18 Southwestern Bell tandem to -- excuse me --
19 Southwestern Bell end office to CLEC end office,
20 and Southwestern Bell tandem to CLEC end office.
21 That means you're only measuring one way. Right?
22 That's what is being reported in PM 70. You're
23 not reporting the traffic coming from the other
24 side?
25 MS. MICHAELS: That's correct.

1 the calls actually were completed.
2 MR. SRINIVASA: Well, blockage --
3 the formula for calculating the blockage is how
4 many calls came into the switch, how many calls
5 made it. So how many calls made it through --
6 you know, how many calls were able to pass
7 through the trunks and complete it is in the
8 numerator. The denominator is how many calls
9 came into that switch. They don't have peg
10 counts, so I don't know how they can calculate
11 the blockage. But, anyway, we'll take it up
12 later.
13 MS. NELSON: Once Time Warner has
14 an ability to check and see if Southwestern
15 Bell's explanation satisfies them or whether
16 they still want disaggregation for one-way
17 trunks.
18 MS. KNIGHT: Okay. Then I'll talk
19 with them.
20 MR. SRINIVASA: Okay.
21 MR. DYSART: This is Randy Dysart,
22 Southwestern Bell. The next issue I think that
23 came up was regarding the calculation about --
24 for the exclusions. The way Southwestern Bell
25 does it, if a trunk group is -- or if there's

Page 21

1 exclusions, we exclude the blocked calls from
2 both the numerator and denominator. And I think
3 there was an issue between that methodology and
4 excluding the entire trunk group. It's our
5 belief that the appropriate way, since we're
6 measuring blocked calls, is simply to exclude
7 those calls that are blocked to apply these
8 exclusions. And it's -- if -- for example, if
9 there were -- we excluded 30 blocked calls, 30
10 would be taken from the numerator and the
11 denominator.

12 MR. SRINIVASA: Okay. So calls
13 that were originating from your side that are
14 going to be terminated to a CLEC switch, if they
15 have -- (inaudible) out their trunk ports for
16 some maintenance purposes, then you're not going
17 to count that. Those are excluded calls.
18 Right?

19 MR. DYSART: Correct. Randy
20 Dysart, Southwestern Bell. Any of these
21 exclusions that would apply, that's the
22 methodology that we're using.

23 MS. NELSON: Whose proposal is
24 this?

25 MR. DYSART: I think this is an

Page 23

1 opposition to that?

2 MR. DYSART: I believe there was.

3 MS. NELSON: Okay. Would any CLEC
4 like to address that issue?

5 (No response)

6 MR. DYSART: Maybe there wasn't.

7 (Laughter)

8 MS. FETTIG: Can you restate one
9 more time what you think the issue is?

10 MR. DYSART: Right. What we were
11 doing -- or asking to do is that since it is a
12 benchmark, that we don't report Southwestern
13 Bell end office to Southwestern Bell end office
14 trunk, that type of thing, or Southwestern Bell
15 end office to tandem type trunk since we are
16 dealing with the benchmark.

17 MR. SRINIVASA: Okay.
18 Apparently -- I don't know who raised that as an
19 issue.

20 MS. NELSON: Okay. Let's --

21 MR. SRINIVASA: Before we move on
22 to the next -- 70 -- apparently the benchmark is
23 at 1 percent, and -- now, looking at the
24 historic data, should we need to apply the
25 critical Z for this? You know, if you do a low

Page 22

1 issue that came up -- because I thought we might
2 have touched on this one of the last meetings we
3 had. And this was just an issue that we had
4 highlighted that someone had brought up. I
5 don't know that anyone formally presented this.

6 MR. SRINIVASA: And also, you were
7 going to report as part of 70.1 what were --

8 MR. DYSART: Correct.

9 MR. SRINIVASA: -- how many calls
10 were excluded.

11 MR. DYSART: That's correct.

12 MR. SRINIVASA: You also were
13 going to state the reasons why those calls were
14 excluded identifying --

15 MR. DYSART: Correct.

16 MR. SRINIVASA: -- with the bullet
17 points in here on the exclusion.

18 MR. DYSART: Correct. And then
19 the other issue was Southwestern Bell had
20 requested that the disaggregation for
21 Southwestern Bell to Southwestern Bell target
22 trunks not be provided since this is a benchmark
23 and doesn't seem to be applicable to this
24 measurement.

25 MS. NELSON: And there was

Page 24

1 critical Z, then you're essentially increasing
2 the blockage rate that historically you haven't
3 had any problem meeting that benchmark.

4 MS. EMCH: This is Marsha Emch
5 with WorldCom. We would always support removing
6 the critical Z from any measure.

7 MR. SRINIVASA: Well, initially it
8 was set that we did not have enough data that
9 the critical Z alone was too low for the random
10 variation or any that was there.

11 MS. EMCH: But particularly when
12 performance is well. I just wanted to say --

13 MS. NELSON: Mr. Dysart, did you
14 want to respond?

15 MR. DYSART: Yeah. This is Randy
16 Dysart, Southwestern Bell. I think I'd like
17 to, before I commit to this, take it back and
18 look at it. Because right now we -- if you look
19 at the aggregate state level, there's probably
20 not a big issue here. But if you divide it down
21 into the four market areas, you know, we're
22 dealing with smaller sample sizes. So I'm not
23 sure that I can agree to that today, but I'll
24 definitely take it back and look at it.

25 MS. NELSON: Okay. So let's just

Page 25

1 go over sort of our list of what needs to be
2 done on this measure before we move on. Time
3 Warner is going to report this afternoon, I
4 guess, on the one-way issue. Southwestern Bell
5 is going to modify the measure to incorporate
6 the 20-day time frame and the performance remedy
7 plan insofar as reporting the data on this
8 measure, and Southwestern Bell is going to
9 report back on removing the critical Z from the
10 benchmark. Was there anything else that was
11 still open?

12 MS. FETTIG: This is Eva Fettig
13 from AT&T. I just wanted to make one comment on
14 the Z versus just using the benchmark at the
15 1 percent blocking standard. My understanding
16 was that Southwestern Bell's technical
17 requirements documentation does have just a
18 1 percent blocking criteria in it to match the
19 ANSI standards for those switched trunk groups.
20 And my guess is that we should be measuring off
21 what -- the ANSI and the SWBT technical
22 references state that they engineered those
23 trunk groups to be.

24 MR. SRINIVASA: All right.
25 Another alternative is -- you know, if you don't

Page 26

1 want a benchmark, then parity. You know,
2 apparently your proposal is to remove
3 Southwestern Bell disaggregation, so --

4 MR. DYSART: Maybe I'll throw this
5 out. Randy Dysart, Southwestern Bell. If we
6 could take this measure at a state level, I
7 could commit today to get rid of the critical Z,
8 instead of at a market area level.

9 MS. KNIGHT: I don't believe
10 that's acceptable to Time Warner. Really, we
11 would prefer to see the measure at a city level
12 rather than market areas.

13 MR. SRINIVASA: I don't know if
14 you know that the Commission, in previous Open
15 Meetings, has made it clear that you're required
16 to reduce the number of PMs, not increase. We
17 already have about 2,000 different levels of
18 disaggregation. Our goal is to reduce. And the
19 city level probably would put it into 10,000 or
20 maybe more. I don't want to do that.

21 MS. NELSON: But we understand
22 what you're saying is you don't want it reduced
23 beyond the level it's already at.

24 MS. KNIGHT: Right.

25 MS. NELSON: Mr. Cowlshaw.

Page 27

1 MR. COWLISHAW: Yeah. Pat
2 Cowlshaw. I mean, the different -- even in the
3 four market areas we've got it currently, we're
4 at least capturing issues related to different
5 tandems, which have been problems from time to
6 time. And at least in terms of the aggregate
7 data, looking at the study week alone, current
8 data has -- in tandems, you're talking, you
9 know, one and a half to seven and a half million
10 calls in the study week, even in the individual
11 four market areas. So it certainly shouldn't be
12 a statistical size of sample issue.

13 MR. SRINIVASA: Let me ask the
14 CLECs this. For diagnostic purposes, just to
15 know what your blockage is like, if they report
16 to you, on a disaggregated level, the damages
17 and assessments at the state level, then how
18 would that play out? If you want to know what
19 blockage is for diagnostic purposes, they would
20 provide you. But for damage and assessment,
21 it's at the state level.

22 MS. EMCH: This is Marsha Emch
23 with WorldCom. The immediate problem I see with
24 that is damages at the Tier 1 level are supposed
25 to in some way, you know, provide reparation for

Page 28

1 harms to customers -- and these are customer
2 calls that are being blocked. It's a direct
3 relationship to customer affecting. So I don't
4 see how you would want to make that diagnostic
5 when it's --

6 MS. NELSON: No, no, no. No.
7 Damages are paid -- statewide aggregate level.
8 There is damage, but they're not going to break
9 it down. Say, for example, right now there's a
10 performance report for Houston. There's one for
11 South Texas. And if they miss any of those,
12 there's damage associated for each area.

13 MS. EMCH: So are you saying the
14 damage level wouldn't change? It would just
15 be --

16 MR. SRINIVASA: The damage level
17 would be aggregate. If the aggregate --

18 MS. EMCH: Aggregate for a CLEC at
19 Tier 1?

20 MR. SRINIVASA: Aggregate for
21 individual CLECs. Aggregate in the sense for
22 market regions --

23 MS. EMCH: As opposed to four --
24 possibly paying on four different times.

25 MR. SRINIVASA: Right.

Page 29

1 MS. EMCH: Okay. I understand
2 your proposal now. Let me think about that.
3 MS. NELSON: Okay. If you could,
4 get back to us on that. And also, Southwestern
5 Bell needs to also modify PM 70 to remove the
6 disaggregation for the Southwestern Bell to
7 Southwestern Bell trunks.
8 MR. SRINIVASA: But you'll still
9 get the information on a disaggregated basis for
10 diagnostic purposes for you to know where the
11 problems are.
12 MR. COWLISHAW: I guess -- I might
13 suggest we think also about something a little
14 bit different, which would be -- as a footnote,
15 I don't think right now we're getting even
16 reported to CLECs on an individual CLEC basis
17 state level data. We only get geographic data.
18 But I think what you're doing when you put them
19 together is you're sort of melding low
20 traffic -- maybe it's South Texas with high
21 traffic Houston.
22 In terms of the remedy plan for an
23 individual CLEC, what might make sense is to
24 have the Tier 1 continue to operate off of the
25 disaggregated data with no Z score applying, but

Page 30

1 have Tier 2 operate off of the state level data.
2 And so their exposure to aggregate industry
3 penalty would be based on statewide performance.
4 But if they're causing blocking problems to a
5 CLEC -- and we're talking about four pretty big
6 gross market areas -- they would still have an
7 incentive, under the remedy plan, to cure that
8 problem in the area for the CLEC.
9 MR. SRINIVASA: So, under that
10 scenario, you still want the critical Z to
11 apply -- to not apply?
12 MR. COWLISHAW: Correct. But
13 they -- and they would get the -- and they would
14 get the benefit of the aggregation on the Tier 2
15 side of it, but not on the Tier 1.
16 MS. NELSON: Okay. It sounds like
17 that's something that could be discussed
18 off-line, like at a break or something, because
19 it sounds like the parties are not very far
20 apart on resolving the issue.
21 MR. DYSART: We'd be happy to look
22 at it.
23 MS. NELSON: Okay. If you can, do
24 that and report back after lunch. We'll move on
25 to 70.1.

Page 31

1 MS. KNIGHT: I just have one --
2 Time Warner -- one clarification on 70. On the
3 exclusion -- I believe it's the sixth bullet --
4 related to the 25 percent above the forecast. I
5 just wanted to validate and clarify that that
6 applies to the total trunk groups, not a single
7 trunk group for a city's forecast.
8 MS. MICHAELS: This is Teresa
9 Michaels, Southwestern Bell. No. The forecast
10 applies at a trunk group level when the
11 calculation is done, because you're looking at a
12 trunk group, not the total CLEC forecast for the
13 entire market area or the entire state.
14 MS. KNIGHT: Okay. So, in Austin,
15 I've got 20 trunk groups, end office and tandem.
16 So, if one of those trunk groups within that
17 forecast is more than 25 percent above, you
18 exclude everything for that city?
19 MR. DYSART: No, not everything
20 for the city.
21 MS. MICHAELS: Not everything for
22 the city. Just that single trunk group. It's
23 only that single trunk group's activity.
24 MS. KNIGHT: Okay.
25 MS. NELSON: Mr. Cowlshaw.

Page 32

1 MR. COWLISHAW: I guess it seems
2 to me like if what they what to be judged on is
3 their aggregate performance across the Greater
4 Houston Area, one-fourth of the state, CLECs
5 shouldn't be held to forecast precision at a
6 trunk group level, but ought to be held to
7 forecast precision at that exact same level.
8 MS. NELSON: Mr. Dysart, could you
9 respond, because that thought occurred to me as
10 soon as y'all answered the question.
11 MR. DYSART: The problem with --
12 that is that the trunk group -- that's where you
13 get the blockage on. So, if you generated a
14 forecast that said you needed five trunks for
15 this particular trunk group and it's a final
16 trunk group, you may really have needed 100. So
17 I'm catching all that overflow. Well, as an
18 aggregate, you could have forecasted on another
19 trunk group that you needed 100 and you only
20 needed five. So there I'm not overflowing. I
21 don't have much peg count. So overall you
22 forecasted approximately the right number of
23 trunks that you needed, but in that one
24 particular trunk group, you forecasted so badly
25 that that's where all the blockage is occurring.

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 33</p> <p>1 So, the way we designed the network, it's based 2 on the trunk group, not on an aggregate. If 3 everything overflowed, it probably wouldn't be a 4 huge issue. But, unfortunately, you've got to 5 be very accurate on your finals, or you're going 6 to incur blockage. And an overall forecast just 7 doesn't work to meet that requirement. 8 MS. KNIGHT: I don't believe 9 that's acceptable to Time Warner. 10 MS. NELSON: Can you respond to 11 his factual assertions, though? 12 MS. KNIGHT: Yeah. I understand 13 what he's saying, but I think there's so many 14 nuances within the trunk group and the market 15 changes, I don't find this acceptable. I would 16 like to talk more with my SMEs on the trunking, 17 but we wouldn't want to see the entire city's 18 forecast excluded because of one trunk group. 19 MR. DYSART: This is Randy Dysart, 20 Southwestern Bell. It's not the entire city's 21 forecast. It's only the blockage on that one 22 trunk group that's excluded. 23 MS. KNIGHT: On that particular 24 trunk group? 25 MR. DYSART: Right. The others</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 35</p> <p>1 the market area level. I mean, getting back to 2 the whole point, it's really comparing apples 3 and oranges if you're holding the CLECs to a 4 specific finite criteria for exclusion but not 5 the same thing on the Southwestern Bell side. 6 Because a customer who is calling and gets their 7 call blocked doesn't get the benefit of excess 8 capacity somewhere else in that market region. 9 MR. DYSART: This is Randy 10 Dysart -- 11 MR. DRUMMOND: Your Honor -- 12 MR. DYSART: I'm sorry. Go ahead. 13 MS. NELSON: Mr. Drummond. 14 MR. DRUMMOND: Eric Drummond. We 15 support the AT&T SME. It appears to me the most 16 consistent and reasonable approach -- and this 17 is something we could probably talk off-line -- 18 is that we make sure we disaggregate this or 19 aggregate it so that it's consistent across the 20 board, so that the kinds of information and 21 protection that we assumed would be in this 22 performance measure would actually take place. 23 MR. SRINIVASA: Let me ask you 24 this. You're saying that if the calculation is 25 changed, the CLECs are willing to provide</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 34</p> <p>1 are still included in there. It's just the 2 trunk group that causes the blockage. 3 MR. SRINIVASA: The problem is, is 4 it possible for CLECs to provide forecasts for 5 each trunk group? That's the issue. 6 MR. DYSART: This is Randy Dysart, 7 Southwestern Bell. I agree it's a huge issue, 8 and it's difficult to do. But on the other 9 hand -- and I sympathize with their problem. 10 But on the other hand, they're the only ones 11 that can forecast this. Southwestern Bell has 12 no ability to know their marketing strategies or 13 how they're going to route their traffic, so we 14 can't adjust to a situation that they're having 15 difficulty figuring out. So I agree it's a 16 totally difficult issue, but it's more difficult 17 for us, because we don't even know their plan. 18 MS. FETTIG: This is Eva Fettig 19 from AT&T. I guess then I would take a look at 20 designing the calculation at the trunk group 21 level and aggregating it up. I'm not suggesting 22 that you report it at a disaggregated level, but 23 I think that -- if that's the case, then we 24 should be calculating the blocking and the 25 penalty at the trunk group level rather than at</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 36</p> <p>1 forecasts at the trunk group level? 2 MS. FETTIG: We have meetings 3 every six months with Southwestern Bell working 4 through each market area, looking at each set of 5 trunk groups to see what trunk groups need to be 6 augmented. So I know that we're doing that at 7 the trunk group level. 8 MS. NELSON: And Southwestern Bell 9 is willing to accept forecasts more than every 10 six months, though. Are you not willing to 11 accept them quarterly? 12 MR. DYSART: That's correct. 13 MS. NELSON: Okay. 14 MR. SRINIVASA: So, if they are 15 giving you the forecast at the trunk group 16 level -- well, if it's disaggregated by trunk 17 groups, there will be a million trunk groups, 18 probably. 19 MR. DYSART: This is Randy Dysart, 20 Southwestern Bell. I think there's a couple of 21 issues. I understand your points here, but 22 there's also the other issue that we get -- we 23 don't get any damages because you've ordered too 24 many trunks, and we're tying up our facilities 25 out there and we've had to order tandems because</p>

Page 37

1 you've got spare trunk groups you're not using.
2 So there's both sides of this issue. And I know
3 it's a dilemma, and I'm not saying anybody does
4 that intentionally, because it's a tough job to
5 try to forecast what your traffic is going to
6 be. But on the other hand, it's a tough job
7 when we don't know what's going to happen. And
8 to do it by trunk group level as far as
9 assessing damages is virtually impossible to do.
10 And this was the best option that we could get,
11 particularly with the ability to do a quarterly
12 forecast. And I think the big issue came around
13 this exclusion at 25 percent on the trunk group
14 level when it was a six-month forecast. But
15 since we agreed to the quarterly forecast, I
16 would think it would be easier to predict
17 reasonable accuracy on a trunk group at that
18 time frame.

19 MS. KNIGHT: Time Warner. I just
20 wanted to clarify a couple of points. I do
21 believe you have a policy in place to deal with
22 under utilization of trunk groups. So, if we
23 are overtrunking -- I mean, you have a process
24 to manage that and to retrieve those trunks. In
25 addition, we have been advised on the quarterly

Page 38

1 forecast that -- from the Southwestern point of
2 view, it's good to have. You are not
3 guaranteeing that you're going to size your
4 network based upon those quarterly forecasts.

5 MR. DYSART: This is Randy Dysart.
6 We may not size it. But if you have the
7 forecast and we don't size it appropriately
8 based on that forecast, it's included in this
9 performance measure.

10 MS. KNIGHT: Based upon the
11 quarterly forecast?

12 MR. DYSART: Based upon your
13 quarterly forecast.

14 MS. KNIGHT: All right. That
15 tightens that up considerably.

16 MS. NELSON: Okay. So could y'all
17 try to address that issue of the last exclusion
18 and how that fits overall into the
19 disaggregation level off-line and report back
20 later today?

21 MR. DYSART: Okay.

22 MR. SIEGEL: Howard Siegel, IP
23 Communications. Before we leave that, one thing
24 we might want to do is at least -- although
25 there's certainly no agreement on the sixth

Page 39

1 bullet, at least modify the language to be
2 consistent to clarify Southwestern Bell's
3 intent.

4 MS. NELSON: I think before we can
5 do that we need to decide -- we need to arrive
6 at a final consensus on what the measurement is
7 going to be and how -- what level of
8 disaggregation is going to be, and then -- if
9 this is going to be left in place, it should be
10 modified, if Southwestern Bell intends to
11 continue requiring trunk forecasting at a trunk
12 level. Okay. Let's move on to 70.1.

13 MR. DYSART: I believe 70.1 is
14 probably tied closely to whatever happens in 77.

15 MS. NELSON: It looked like it.
16 So let's move on to 71, then.

17 MR. DYSART: 71 -- we had an
18 action item to modify the business rule to more
19 appropriately reflect the common transport trunk
20 blockage. We've done that. It's not shown
21 here. I can read you the language. It's --
22 basically it says, "Common transport trunks that
23 reflect the highest average blocking during the
24 most recent four weeks of data."

25 MS. NELSON: And where does that

Page 40

1 go?

2 MR. DYSART: That goes in the
3 business rule.

4 MS. NELSON: Okay.

5 MS. McCALL: Cindy McCall,
6 WorldCom. Could you repeat that again quickly?

7 MR. DYSART: Sure. "Common
8 transport trunk groups that reflect the highest
9 average blocking during the most recent four
10 weeks of data."

11 MS. McCALL: Cindy McCall,
12 WorldCom. Are you still using the busy hour?

13 MS. SAIEVA: Yes, we do use --
14 Gina Saieva. Yes, we do use the busy hour.

15 MS. McCALL: So it's the busiest
16 hour of the month?

17 MS. SAIEVA: It's the -- using the
18 four weeks worth of data, it is average data.
19 We also use a time consistent busy hour. So
20 every hour is looked at, and the highest

21 blocking -- or offered load for whatever that
22 hour may be is the hour that's shown.

23 MR. SRINIVASA: So, for each
24 day -- four-week period, you're looking at the
25 traffic and time consistent data -- for each

<p>Page 41</p> <p>1 hour you're looking at what the blockage was -- 2 whatever is the highest, you pick that? 3 MS. SAEVA: It averages over the 4 four-week period, and it picks the highest. It 5 looks at your highest offered load, and it looks 6 at your highest blocking. 7 MR. SRINIVASA: Okay. Did you 8 understand that? 9 MS. McCALL: That's still kind of 10 fuzzy. 11 MS. SAEVA: Do you want me to try 12 again? 13 MS. McCALL: Yeah. 14 MS. SAEVA: For every week it 15 looks at -- I think it starts at 6:00 in the 16 morning, and I don't -- I think it's midnight. 17 Is it midnight or later? 8:00 a.m. to midnight, 18 and it looks at every hour. Okay. So then 19 it looks -- the system for every one of those 20 weeks, as it looks at every hour, it calculates 21 every single hour, and that's why it's called a 22 time consistent busy hour. It takes the average 23 of those four weeks. At the end of those four 24 weeks, it looks at the highest offered load or 25 the highest blocking. So it could be 10:00 in</p>	<p>Page 43</p> <p>1 MR. COWLISHAW: Okay. So, if 2 there is blocking, that's picked. 3 MS. SAEVA: Correct. That's the 4 first pick. 5 MR. SRINIVASA: There's a bullet 6 point in here, data should be gathered for the 7 busiest hour of the entire -- what you just 8 stated, that language should be put in here. 9 MR. DYSART: Yeah. I think we 10 need to modify our language a little bit to 11 better reflect what we just put on the record. 12 MS. NELSON: Right. 13 MR. DYSART: So we'll do that. 14 But I think that covers that. 15 MS. NELSON: And will you provide 16 that language next Monday like you -- 17 MR. DYSART: Yes, we will. 18 MS. NELSON: Okay. 19 MR. DYSART: 72, I think that -- 20 what we just discussed resolves 72. 73, the 21 only issue I had out there was disaggregate by 22 911, OS/DA, SS7, interconnection trunks. We 23 will agree to do that. 24 MS. NELSON: Would you repeat 25 that?</p>
<p>Page 42</p> <p>1 the morning. It could be 10:00 at night. 2 MR. SRINIVASA: Let me understand 3 this. The four-week period, 8:00 a.m. to 4 9:00 a.m., 9:00 a.m. to 10:00, 10:00 to 11:00, 5 you take those groups and you take the busy hour 6 for each day and you average it out for the 7 four-week period? 8 MS. SAEVA: Every hour of every 9 day -- every hour of every week is averaged out. 10 So the 8:00 is averaged for those four weeks. 11 9:00 is averaged for those four weeks, 10:00, 12 et cetera. 13 MR. SRINIVASA: And whichever is 14 the highest, that's what you -- 15 MS. SAEVA: Correct. 16 MS. McCALL: Thank you. Now I 17 understand. 18 MR. COWLISHAW: But which one 19 governs as between highest offered load or 20 highest blockage? 21 MS. SAEVA: Well, you don't 22 always have blocking on a trunk group, so the 23 system looks for the highest blocking, and if 24 there is no blocking, it picks the highest 25 offered load.</p>	<p>Page 44</p> <p>1 MR. DYSART: Yeah. The issue 2 was -- they wanted this 73 measurement 3 disaggregate by 911, OS/DA, SS7, and it's 4 currently for interconnection trunks. And we 5 agreed to add those levels of disaggregation. 6 MR. SRINIVASA: Aren't you 7 reporting it, though, right now? 8 MR. DYSART: I don't think for 9 this measure -- we are for 78, I believe. 10 MS. NELSON: Okay. So will you 11 just provide the change, then, under the levels 12 of disaggregation? 13 MR. DYSART: Yes, I will. 14 MS. KNIGHT: Time Warner would 15 like a clarification on this measure. Does this 16 also include orders that are being held for 17 facilities? 18 MR. DYSART: Yes. 19 MS. KNIGHT: Okay. 20 MR. COWLISHAW: Pat Cowlishaw. 21 I'm wondering if we could clarify consistent -- 22 kind of what we've been doing with missed due 23 dates elsewhere in the document if, in the 24 business rule, it would be appropriate to begin 25 by saying the valid customer requested due date</p>

Page 45

1 starts the clock, meaning we request one within
2 an appropriate interval?

3 MR. DYSART: This is Randy Dysart,
4 Southwestern Bell. That's more appropriate in
5 78. Measurement 73 is for situations where if,
6 for example, you send an order in and you say,
7 "I want it in 25 days," and we know there are no
8 facilities available to do it within 25 days,
9 then we'll FOC back the date we can meet it.
10 That's 73. It's measured against what we commit
11 to. 73.1 does exactly what you're saying, if
12 it's a valid date. And then 78 does a similar
13 thing for average. So it's captured. It's just
14 that this is a different measurement. This is
15 our commitment.

16 MR. SRINIVASA: I see some
17 nodding, so it should be --

18 MR. COWLISHAW: We've got to get
19 penalties straight on 73.1, but I think --

20 MR. DYSART: Yeah.

21 MR. SRINIVASA: In the business
22 rule, there's some underlying language,
23 "Unsolicited FOCs will not be acknowledged in
24 calculating due dates. That is, if an
25 unsolicited FOC is received by CLEC, the due

Page 46

1 date on the first FOC will still be used as the
2 due date."

3 MR. DYSART: Correct. And this is
4 language that MCI had -- or WorldCom had
5 requested, and we agreed to put it in there.

6 MR. SRINIVASA: What does it mean?
7 I'm trying to understand.

8 MS. EMCH: Sure. This is Marsha
9 Emch with WorldCom. The business rule was put
10 in to avoid the situations where we send the ASR
11 for the interconnection trunk and we get a due
12 date back on that of -- let's say it's June 8.
13 And then sometime between -- or June 15th --
14 sometime between today, June 8th, and June
15 15th we get a second FOC date and we didn't do
16 anything to ask for another date. So
17 unsolicited, if we didn't ask for it.

18 MR. SRINIVASA: So, if you send an
19 ASR and they sent you a FOC and subsequently
20 they send you another different FOC, you don't
21 want that to be --

22 MS. EMCH: And say it's now
23 June 17. They have to go by the June 15 date.

24 MR. DYSART: And we agree with
25 that.

Page 47

1 MS. NELSON: Okay. Let's move on
2 to --

3 MR. DYSART: 73.1, I believe
4 AT&T had -- at least this is what I have down
5 here -- proposed a medium and low for Tier 1 and
6 Tier 2 for 73.1. We agreed with that, and we'll
7 incorporate that.

8 MS. KNIGHT: Time Warner would
9 like a clarification, and it's the definition is
10 percentage of held interconnection trunks
11 greater than 90 calendar days. So does 73
12 address facility issues that are shorter than 90
13 days?

14 MS. NELSON: Right. That would be
15 my question, because you've got it disaggregated
16 by 30, 60, and 90 days. So you're measuring for
17 30, 60, and 90.

18 MR. DYSART: This is Randy Dysart.
19 We had agreed to measure it at 30, 60, but
20 damages are applicable at 90 days.

21 MS. KNIGHT: Okay.

22 MS. NELSON: Is that what AT&T had
23 requested?

24 MR. COWLISHAW: What, the 90-day
25 piece of it that we just talked about?

Page 48

1 MS. NELSON: Right. I mean, do
2 you agree that the Tier 1 and Tier 2 medium and
3 low would be tied to the 90 days, or --

4 MR. COWLISHAW: Well, I mean
5 this -- I guess our response is this was a
6 measure that was created in response to the
7 Commission concerns in the October to December
8 '99 time frame. And given the way the measure
9 was formulated and the definition of the
10 measure, I guess our -- and not really having
11 participated in the creation of it, it appeared
12 that the intent was that 90 days was the
13 trigger. If that wasn't the Commission's
14 intent, then it might be different. But based
15 on just reading the title of the definition of
16 the rule, I think we probably formed the
17 impression that 90 days was what was viewed as
18 the target. And if that's right, then -- it was
19 kind of on that basis that we went along with
20 the 90 days being the -- as Randy had described,
21 recovering for damages purposes.

22 MS. NELSON: I think that the
23 purpose of the six-month review is -- you know,
24 we've got historic data now, and what we're
25 asking is is 90 days the appropriate measure.

Page 49

Page 51

1 MR. DRUMMOND: Your Honor, Eric
2 Drummond with Time Warner. I think it's
3 accurate. From the very beginning there's been
4 some concern that the 90 days was a time period
5 that was too great, but that we would at least
6 wait until we had our six-month review to see
7 whether or not it was more appropriate to
8 shorten that time period.
9 MS. NELSON: Right.
10 MR. SRINIVASA: March and April
11 data -- statewide aggregate, they had reported
12 greater than 90 days was zero percent, and 60
13 days was 2.5 in March, zero in April. Greater
14 than 30 days was 2.5 in March, zero in April.
15 Of course, in April, number of trunk circuits
16 held dropped also from lack of facilities.
17 MR. DYSART: This is Randy Dysart,
18 Southwestern Bell. I think one thing we've got
19 to also look at is 73.1 and 78 are kind of
20 corresponding measures. 78 is basically an
21 average that's based on 20 days. It doesn't
22 matter whether we've got facilities or not. If
23 after the 21st day -- which 20 days is the
24 commitment time. After that we can -- you know,
25 all that time runs. There's no -- FOC date

1 it's still -- in 78 it's trunk. It's based on a
2 valid and accurate ASR. But I still believe
3 it's trunks. So -- I mean, I'd have to think
4 about 60 days.
5 MS. BOURIANOFF: Randy, isn't 78
6 trunk orders and 73.1 trunk circuits?
7 MR. DYSART: 73.1 is trunk
8 circuits. My only -- I think what I would have
9 to take back and look at -- when we talk about a
10 trunk order in a trunking environment, that's
11 usually a trunk circuit. So I'd have to check
12 that out.
13 MR. COWLISHAW: The data says --
14 the labeling data is number of orders under
15 78.01. I know that doesn't always --
16 MR. DYSART: Well, in trunking,
17 sometimes we call a trunk order -- we issue a
18 trunk order for one trunk. And I'd just have to
19 verify that.
20 MS. BOURIANOFF: I mean, the
21 business rule talks about the measurements taken
22 for all ASRs.
23 MR. DYSART: Right.
24 MS. NELSON: Yeah. I guess
25 staff's concern would be if 78 is measuring

Page 50

Page 52

1 doesn't come back into play. If we FOC it back
2 later than the 20 days and you want a 20-day
3 interval, it doesn't matter. It's calculated in
4 78. So these two are kind of similar in one
5 respect. So I think that's why -- I still would
6 prefer the 90 days.
7 MS. NELSON: So you're saying it's
8 not excluded due to lack of facilities under 78?
9 MR. DYSART: In 78. That's
10 correct.
11 MS. NELSON: And so Southwestern
12 Bell's concern would be that you be penalized
13 under the same miss under both 78 and 73.1 if it
14 was a lack of facilities issue?
15 MR. DYSART: Right. Particularly
16 if you start going down to 30 days. And also in
17 73.1, to address some concerns, we took off kind
18 of lack of facilities and just had anything held
19 greater than 30, 60, or 90.
20 MS. NELSON: Would Southwestern
21 Bell agree to 60 days?
22 MR. SRINIVASA: You know, in 78
23 it's ASRs. Here it's trunks. You know, the
24 ASRs are different.
25 MR. DYSART: I believe, though,

1 average trunk interval and it's at an ASR level,
2 it's not going to be weighted according to how
3 many trunks are being requested. And 73.1 is
4 based on the number of interconnection trunks.
5 MR. SRINIVASA: If there are 100
6 trunks and one is missed, it's still a miss. If
7 90 are missed, it's still a miss. There's only
8 one miss.
9 MS. NELSON: Do you understand
10 that concern, Randy?
11 MR. DYSART: Yes, I do.
12 MS. NELSON: Okay. Given that,
13 could you just take back the issue of the 30,
14 60, or 90 days and then report on that?
15 MR. DYSART: We'll do that.
16 MS. FETTIG: This is Eva Fettig.
17 I'm just looking at this. Do we need to just
18 take out in the calculation -- you said that we
19 were going to look for all reasons why the trunk
20 order was held, but we didn't add up the
21 calculation to take out for lack of facilities.
22 MR. DYSART: Right. I had that
23 marked on mine to take out. I was going to
24 bring that up.
25 MS. FETTIG: Okay.

Page 53	Page 55
<p>1 MR. DYSART: Thanks for pointing 2 that out.</p> <p>3 MS. KNIGHT: And Time Warner wants 4 to clarify that facilities include physical 5 plant, DAX ports, and terminations.</p> <p>6 MR. DYSART: I think in the new 7 measurement -- I don't think it matters, because 8 it's going to be -- really it should be -- the 9 calculation should be counted trunk circuits 10 held greater than whatever we determine --</p> <p>11 MS. KNIGHT: So regardless of the 12 reason?</p> <p>13 MR. DYSART: So regardless of what 14 it's going to be.</p> <p>15 MS. KNIGHT: Okay.</p> <p>16 MS. NELSON: Okay. Are we ready 17 to move on to 74?</p> <p>18 MR. DYSART: 74, we agree -- the 19 only issue I had was disaggregate by 911, OS/DA, 20 and SS7. We agreed to do that.</p> <p>21 MS. NELSON: And you'll modify the 22 language?</p> <p>23 MR. DYSART: We'll modify the 24 language. 75, this one I believe we would like 25 to eliminate since it, right now, would be</p>	<p>1 measurement type to have one measure, but then a 2 tiered approach for a penalty.</p> <p>3 MR. DYSART: Let me ask a 4 question.</p> <p>5 MR. SRINIVASA: Those are held 6 orders. This is regardless. If they missed it, 7 they missed it.</p> <p>8 MR. DYSART: As I read, though, 9 the way we modified 73.1, it really -- let's 10 forget the penalty for just a second. It pretty 11 much is 75, because what we're saying is -- 12 we're not going to make it held due to 13 facilities. It's anytime we miss one that's 14 outside the normal interval that we have here. 15 So --</p> <p>16 MS. NELSON: 73 is a parity 17 measure.</p> <p>18 MR. DYSART: Right. And 75 is a 19 bit different because it looks at the due date, 20 which is compared to 74. Okay. I'll withdraw 21 my --</p> <p>22 MS. NELSON: Yeah.</p> <p>23 MR. DYSART: -- comment. And it 24 was -- the other issue was disaggregate. We 25 will do that.</p>
Page 54	Page 56
<p>1 fairly close to 73.1, as we've written it.</p> <p>2 MS. NELSON: Could the CLECs 3 respond to that?</p> <p>4 MR. SRINIVASA: This is greater 5 than 30 days. If 73.1 --</p> <p>6 MR. DYSART: We're already 7 providing the 30, 60, 90, so --</p> <p>8 MR. SRINIVASA: There's a 9 benchmark for how many you can have greater than 10 30 days in this measure. They're, if we go with 11 60 days being applicable, assuming that's where 12 we're going to go for damages --</p> <p>13 MS. NELSON: I mean, Southwestern 14 Bell needs to consider that staff -- I think 15 what Nara is saying is staff would be reluctant 16 to eliminate this measure if 73.1 ends up in 17 anything greater than 30 days.</p> <p>18 MS. FETTIG: This is Eva Fettig 19 from AT&T. I mean, you could always tier the 20 measurement type. In the interest of having 21 fewer measures than more measures, you could 22 just take 73.1 and disaggregate it and have, you 23 know, at 30 days a low penalty, and then at 60 24 days a medium, and then a high or whatever 25 the -- you could just disaggregate the</p>	<p>1 MS. NELSON: So 75 doesn't have 2 any disputes pending?</p> <p>3 MR. DYSART: Correct.</p> <p>4 MS. NELSON: And you'll modify the 5 language?</p> <p>6 MR. DYSART: Yeah. 76 adds the 7 disaggregation, and we'll do that also.</p> <p>8 MR. SRINIVASA: This underlined 9 language --</p> <p>10 MR. DYSART: We added that 11 language in response to one of the 12 clarifications to the CLEC that the time stops 13 when we notify the CLEC of service restoration.</p> <p>14 MS. NELSON: Okay. 77?</p> <p>15 MR. DYSART: 77, the 16 disaggregation was the only issue there, and we 17 agree to do that.</p> <p>18 MS. NELSON: Okay. 78?</p> <p>19 MR. DYSART: 78, the only issue is 20 excludes expedites. And we've done a lot of 21 checking on this one. I think the issue, as I 22 see it, was that if we charge to expedite an 23 order, then they're paying for something extra. 24 And I think it's the feeling of the CLECs that 25 if they're paying for something extra, it</p>

Page 57

1 shouldn't be counted to our favor. What we
2 found out is in reality we don't charge for
3 this. If there's a blockage situation and the
4 CLEC wants an interval less than 20 days, we
5 will do that. And there may be a situation
6 where they have to escalate it up through their
7 account manager, but we don't charge for doing
8 an expedite as it's stated there. So, with
9 that, we don't believe that this is an
10 appropriate exclusion.
11 MS. EMCH: Marsha Emch with
12 WorldCom. Clarification. You don't charge for
13 the trunks? I mean, when you're making those
14 comments, you're particularly talking to this
15 measure?
16 MR. DYSART: Particularly for this
17 measurement. Right.
18 MS. EMCH: Okay.
19 MS. BOURIANOFF: Randy, you said
20 that Southwestern Bell doesn't charge for an
21 expedite if there's a blockage situation. What
22 if the CLEC just -- there's not blocking going
23 on at the trunk, they just want it expedited for
24 their own business purposes ahead of 20 days?
25 Does Southwestern Bell charge for that kind of

Page 58

1 expedite?
2 MS. THOMAS: This is Lisa Thomas
3 with Southwestern Bell. They do not charge for
4 any expedites for expedited trunks of any kind.
5 MR. SRINIVASA: Looking at the
6 historical data that's been reported, what we've
7 come across is there are numerous ASRs that are
8 excluded. In fact, we asked Southwestern Bell
9 to provide us the reason why they were excluded;
10 was it customer cost, how many orders were
11 excluded because a CLEC requested a due date
12 greater than 20 days, and several different
13 categories. And I believe that we wanted to
14 look at this measure to see, you know, is it
15 accurately reflecting what's going on.
16 MS. NELSON: Because our concern
17 was that we were excluding more due dates than
18 you were reporting, and so the measure was not
19 turning out to be as useful as I think staff had
20 anticipated.
21 MR. DYSART: This is Randy Dysart.
22 I think -- and I thought we had provided you
23 some of that many months ago. Not in the recent
24 past, but -- it's only as effective as the due
25 date.

Page 59

1 MS. NELSON: Right. We're not
2 questioning the performance.
3 MR. DYSART: Oh, okay.
4 MS. NELSON: We're questioning
5 the performance measure and whether it should be
6 tied to the customer requested due date instead
7 of the 20 days, or whether there should be a
8 disaggregation by 20 days and then by other
9 requested due dates so that there will be more
10 data reported.
11 MR. SRINIVASA: This was a comment
12 that was filed with the FCC also, I believe,
13 stating that we are going to take a re-look at
14 this PM.
15 MS. FETTIG: This is Eva Fettig
16 from AT&T. I mean, we did change those other
17 UNE measures to include the customer requested
18 due date.
19 MR. DYSART: I would think if
20 we're going to do that, probably the appropriate
21 place to do it, along with what Eva just said,
22 maybe would be in 73, and we word it similar to
23 what we've done in some of the other performance
24 measurements where we talk about the customer
25 desired due date. And if it's an expedite, we

Page 60

1 do it based upon the agreed to time frame.
2 MS. NELSON: I guess the question
3 then becomes how useful, then, is 78?
4 MR. DYSART: Well, I don't think
5 it's particularly useful.
6 MR. SRINIVASA: Should we
7 eliminate that?
8 MS. NELSON: If it's not really
9 capturing all that much data.
10 MR. DYSART: If we incorporate the
11 concept of 78 into maybe 73.
12 MR. SRINIVASA: Maybe make 73
13 Tier 1 high and Tier 2 high to eliminate this?
14 MR. COWLISHAW: Well, I think the
15 thing that's -- 78 is the only place, I believe
16 currently, that we capture the 20-day interval
17 that the Commission set. So, if we're going to
18 make the customer requested -- the percent
19 within customer requested due date operate off
20 of customer requested due date so long as the
21 customer requests nothing shorter than a 20-day
22 interval, then we might be able to get there.
23 MS. BOURIANOFF: I mean, Pat, what
24 we've done with all the UNE measures is we've
25 kept the average measure. Right?

Page 61

1 MR. COWLISHAW: Yeah.
2 MR. DYSART: Made a diagnostic.
3 MS. BOURIANOFF: Right. And then
4 we've reformed the percent within X measure to
5 drive off the customer requested due date
6 because we think that's providing more
7 information. We've had the penalties apply to
8 that measure.
9 MS. NELSON: And that would be
10 fine. If you guys could get together --
11 Southwestern Bell and the CLECs -- and work out
12 some modification, because staff doesn't have a
13 problem keeping this measure, but we want the
14 measure to be meaningful.
15 MR. SRINIVASA: That was the
16 concern raised during the FCC comment.
17 MS. NELSON: Right.
18 MR. DYSART: We can do that.
19 MS. NELSON: Okay. Thank you. So
20 we finished the trunking measures. I guess we
21 can move on to billing. Would now be a good
22 time to take a short break?
23 MR. COWLISHAW: For our homework
24 assignments -- or our day work assignments, I
25 think we -- things got going a little fast for

Page 62

1 us, and we're not sure where we wound up on 73.1
2 and 75.
3 MS. NELSON: Okay. Let me see if
4 I took good notes.
5 MS. BOURIANOFF: And just to
6 clarify, going back to Randy's suggestion about
7 could we eliminate 75 -- is it duplicative of
8 the 73.1? In 73.1, if they would report damages
9 on 30, 60, and 90 days -- not just on 90, I
10 think we would agree that maybe 73.1 encompasses
11 everything in 75.
12 MS. NELSON: Right. I think the
13 homework assignment is for Southwestern Bell and
14 the CLECs to get together and evaluate how the
15 trunk interval -- installation interval should
16 be handled. A component of that is held trunk
17 orders. So staff's goal would be to have a
18 measurement for trunk orders that are held
19 because of lack of facilities, but our other
20 goal would be to have a measure that measures
21 both the 20 business days, as well as any other
22 customer requested due dates, and not just the
23 20 days. Because currently only the 20 business
24 days are being measured, and under 73.1, if
25 they're held due to lack of facilities, that's

Page 63

1 being disaggregated by 30, 60, and 90, but
2 currently it doesn't have damages associated
3 with that.
4 So we would like y'all to get together.
5 And keep in mind that we want a measurement for
6 both the installation interval, whether it be 20
7 days or customer requested due date, and the
8 percentage of interconnection trunks held. Does
9 that answer your question, Mr. Cowlshaw? Okay.
10 Let's take a 15-minute break before we go into
11 billing.
12 (Recess: 10:47 a.m. to 11:06 a.m.)
13 MS. NELSON: We're going to move
14 on to the billing measure.
15 MR. DYSART: Would you like a
16 report on our discussion?
17 MS. NELSON: That would be great.
18 You mean the discussions you just had before we
19 move on to billing?
20 MR. DYSART: Yeah. This is Randy
21 Dysart, Southwestern Bell. I won't go into
22 detail, but I think conceptually we've agreed --
23 at least with AT&T. What would propose, to take
24 those conceptual agreements, and we'll put them
25 into writing and then give them out early in the

Page 64

1 morning for everybody to look at.
2 MS. NELSON: And this would be the
3 73.1 and 78?
4 MR. DYSART: 73, 73.1, 74, 75, and
5 78, I think.
6 MS. NELSON: Okay. That would be
7 great. And we'll take it up first thing
8 tomorrow, then. Okay. Let's move on to PM 14.
9 MR. DRUMMOND: Your Honor, for the
10 record, just to make sure that the record is
11 clear -- Eric Drummond on behalf of the CLEC
12 Coalition, which also includes Rhythms.
13 MS. NELSON: Okay. Thank you.
14 Okay. 14. Do you propose to eliminate this?
15 MR. DYSART: Yeah, we propose to
16 eliminate it. In discussions that we've had, I
17 think eliminating this one is kind of contingent
18 upon -- AT&T and Covad I think had similar 14.1
19 and 14.2s.
20 MS. NELSON: Okay. Let's go ahead
21 and discuss 14.1 and 14.2, then.
22 MS. BOURIANOFF: Your Honor, is
23 there a number that we could have Julie Chambers
24 call in on?
25 MS. NELSON: Yes. She's the chair

Page 65

1 of the CLEC user forum which is meeting today.
2 Okay. Let's go off the record for a second.
3 (Brief pause)
4 MS. NELSON: Okay. Let's go back
5 on the record, then, and go to 14.1. Can
6 someone from AT&T and Rhythms -- this one says
7 Rhythms/Covad, but Mr. Dysart indicated that
8 AT&T proposed something similar. Is that
9 correct?
10 MR. DYSART: This is Randy Dysart.
11 I thought they did, but I could be incorrect.
12 But I know Rhythms did, and I think this might
13 have -- we talked about deciding this related
14 to getting rid of PM 14, I think. So --
15 MS. NELSON: It said that it's
16 contingent upon, you know, the creation of 14.1
17 and 14.2. That's what the CLECs indicated.
18 MR. DYSART: Correct.
19 MR. SRINIVASA: Now, I see your
20 comment that you do not understand what they're
21 proposing. Is there anybody from Rhythms or
22 Covad to explain?
23 MS. SOLIS: Yes. Cindy Solis from
24 Rhythms. If I could give a little bit of
25 history as to why we propose this measurement.

Page 66

1 What we're experiencing is we were getting
2 incorrect bills, and we would have to call
3 Southwestern Bell and ask them to correct it,
4 and Southwestern Bell would send us back a bill
5 that was still incorrect. And so we were having
6 to go back multiple times to ask for corrections
7 on bills. And that's where 14.1 -- why that one
8 was proposed. It was due to not just how many
9 errors are in a single bill, but how many times
10 we got the same bill back that still had errors.
11 MS. NELSON: Mr. Dysart, do you
12 have questions?
13 MS. DILLARD: This is Maria
14 Dillard, Southwestern Bell. In looking at the
15 proposal -- I appreciate the clarification. I
16 understand what you're looking for. The number
17 of errors corrected after the bill is released,
18 there is really nothing that we can do to look
19 at and track that. The only thing right now
20 that we're able to see are the number of claims
21 that come in. There's no electronic means of
22 looking to see what has been corrected. So,
23 initially looking at this, that's -- it's not
24 feasible -- at this point in time, nothing has
25 been developed to do something like that.

Page 67

1 MS. SOLIS: And I think the
2 wording here is a little misleading. I think
3 that it could be worded a lot better, because
4 this -- when I first read this, too, I was under
5 the impression that we wanted to track how many
6 incorrections were on a single bill, and that
7 isn't what we're trying to track.
8 MS. DILLARD: Okay.
9 MS. SOLIS: We want to know when
10 we get, say, a bill for PON No. ABC-123, and we
11 have to send it back for a correction, how many
12 times are we having to send that same bill back
13 to be corrected?
14 MS. DILLARD: So once you have
15 filed a claim indicating that there's something
16 incorrect on a bill, what you're looking for is
17 not that we've corrected that bill, but if you
18 have to come back and ask for the same change to
19 that same account or that same line, whatever
20 you've identified again?
21 MS. SOLIS: I think this would
22 measure both, actually. Because if we're not
23 having to send it back, it would come back -- it
24 would measure that it was actually corrected.
25 MS. DILLARD: Okay. I'm trying to

Page 68

1 understand what you would be proposing on a
2 claim level, basically. So, if we were able to
3 look at the claims coming in and then you
4 indicate that this is a duplicate claim,
5 basically you would want to look at that?
6 MS. SOLIS: Right. And it's just
7 for the bills that we're having to send back,
8 like I say, multiple times to be corrected.
9 MS. DILLARD: Okay. At this point
10 in time, from the top of my head, that would be
11 a completely manual count of claims and reviews.
12 Since we hadn't thought about that in that
13 manner, I'd like to think about that a little
14 bit. It would definitely have to be a manual
15 track. And, of course, there would be some
16 disagreement as to whether or not you actually
17 claimed it the first time and -- you know, maybe
18 that line wasn't already on there.
19 I'd like to offer kind of a
20 counterproposal, though, before we just kind of
21 stop at this point. In the T2A, there's
22 contract language that indicates that if any
23 CLEC is interested in a -- what we call a bill
24 certification process, that Southwestern Bell
25 would be willing to work through a process,

Page 69

1 which is where you come together -- now, it
2 would take a commitment on both sides, of
3 course. But you develop a process of looking at
4 the bills after they've been released and
5 sitting down together perhaps looking at some
6 reports, and coming together and identifying
7 whether or not we all agree that those reports
8 are correct and that the bill is accurate. And
9 we go through that process once a month,
10 basically, correct whatever is there, and then
11 close out that bill period. There is language
12 in the contract to do that. We haven't had any
13 real takers, because it does take a commitment
14 on both sides. So I would prefer -- or at least
15 propose that you look at that contract language
16 and see if that's something that might satisfy
17 this as opposed to doing this in a manual mode.
18 MS. NELSON: Okay. Before we go
19 on, I'd like to go off the record for just a
20 second.
21 (Discussion off the record)
22 MS. NELSON: Let's go back on the
23 record, then. So you're going to look at that
24 issue and then come back to us?
25 MS. DILLARD: Right. And at the

Page 70

1 same time, I'd like to see if the CLECs would be
2 willing to look at that as well.
3 MS. SOLIS: And we will review
4 that.
5 MR. DYSART: Can I ask a
6 clarifying question on the calculation just to
7 make sure I've got it right in my mind? The
8 numerator would be any time you send back a bill
9 that needs to be corrected. So all -- all bills
10 that need to be corrected. Would it include --
11 you'd send it back two times or -- that would be
12 two occurrences or --
13 MS. SOLIS: I think what we would
14 need to measure on this calculation is how many
15 times we've -- not how many times we've sent it
16 back, but how many bills we've had to send back
17 more than once.
18 MR. DYSART: Okay. So really
19 maybe that would be --
20 MR. SRINIVASA: Repeat
21 corrections?
22 MR. DYSART: -- the number of
23 times a bill is sent back for correction, not
24 necessarily the number of bills corrected?
25 MS. SOLIS: No. It would be how

Page 71

1 many bills we've had to send back more than
2 once.
3 MR. DYSART: Oh, more than once.
4 Okay. Number of bills sent back more than once.
5 MS. SOLIS: I think that was the
6 goal of this measurement, is to track how many
7 times we're having to -- not just send it back
8 for a correction, but how many times we're
9 having to send it back, multiple times.
10 MR. DYSART: Okay. And then
11 divided by the total bills -- I'm not sure
12 I understand --
13 MS. NELSON: What would the
14 denominator be?
15 MS. SOLIS: Well, I think that
16 goes back to 14 where I believe Southwestern
17 Bell was proposing an audit.
18 MR. SIEGEL: Howard Siegel, IP
19 Communications. It sounds like the denominator
20 would be the number of bills that were sent back
21 at least one time. Because what you really want
22 to do is -- what percentage of the time did I
23 send something back and I had to send it back
24 again?
25 MR. SRINIVASA: Well, initially 14

Page 72

1 was set in such a way that they would do an
2 audit. And when they do an audit, you know, how
3 many were accurate, and how many were
4 inaccurate. This accuracy reflected how many
5 were accurate. So this was not like every bill
6 that's sent. It's done in an auditing type of
7 process. That's how this was designed.
8 Apparently, this is going to eliminate -- are
9 you -- in your proposal, are you still -- if you
10 retain the total bills audited, are you
11 contemplating that there's going to be an audit
12 process?
13 MS. SOLIS: Actually, I think
14 Howard Siegel's description sounds more like
15 what we're looking for.
16 MR. DYSART: So the denominator,
17 then, would be the total claims -- or the total
18 times you sent it in at least one time.
19 MS. SOLIS: The amount of bills
20 that we had to send in to be corrected at least
21 once.
22 MR. DYSART: Okay. So, total
23 bills sent to be corrected. Okay. Thank you.
24 That helps.
25 MS. NELSON: Okay.

Page 73

Page 75

1 MR. SRINIVASA: So, if they send
2 it a second time, you're not going to count that
3 as another time, are you?
4 MR. DYSART: Well, I guess the way
5 I envision it is if we get a bill in to be
6 corrected, that's the denominator. Now, if
7 we -- if we send it back to you and say it's
8 corrected and you send it back again, that's a
9 count in the numerator.
10 MS. SOLIS: Correct.
11 MR. SRINIVASA: How about the
12 denominator? Do you add that to the denominator
13 also?
14 MR. DYSART: No. The denominator
15 would be the number of bills that you sent back
16 to be corrected.
17 MR. COWLISHAW: Percent of claims
18 not resolved the first time.
19 MR. DYSART: That would be a good
20 definition, yes.
21 MS. NELSON: Okay. So we move on
22 to 14.2, realizing that 14.1 is not closed yet.
23 I think a good start to this -- resolving 14.1
24 would be to have Rhythms rewrite what the
25 proposal would be consistent with the discussion

1 MR. DYSART: Yeah. It would. I
2 think it would need to be diagnostic for a
3 period of time if we agree to it, because I
4 really don't even have any feel for it.
5 MR. SIEGEL: I would say that
6 might be true, with the exception of data
7 providers, because then you can have parity with
8 ASI.
9 MR. DYSART: That would be true.
10 MR. SRINIVASA: Parity with ASI
11 for DLECs?
12 MS. NELSON: Or just parity when
13 there's a Southwestern Bell CLEC?
14 MR. COWLISHAW: I mean, correcting
15 billing errors for data CLECs is not something
16 that ought to be particularly special to DSL. If
17 you're going to go down the path of a parity
18 measure and you believe that -- looking at the
19 data affiliate provides you a way of saying how
20 well does Southwestern Bell correct billing
21 errors for someone that they have some interest
22 in versus how well do they do it for CLECs, that
23 comparison may be as usable across the board as
24 it is for data CLECs. You're talking about do
25 you get the UNE billing categories right? Are

Page 74

Page 76

1 today. If you could, get that to Southwestern
2 Bell by tomorrow morning, and to all the parties
3 as well.
4 MS. SOLIS: Okay.
5 MS. NELSON: Thank you.
6 MS. FETTIG: This is Eva Fettig
7 from AT&T. I guess I'd just like to correct the
8 record in that -- at least on the -- AT&T core
9 side is meeting with Southwestern Bell, and we
10 do have a process by which we audit those bills
11 every month. I want to make sure that we have
12 taken Southwestern Bell up on that offer.
13 MS. DILLARD: Yeah. I apologize.
14 I guess I was thinking that -- from a full bill
15 certification, we are working with AT&T on that,
16 and we've developed some reporting in that
17 manner. I agree.
18 MR. SRINIVASA: So 14.1 -- do you
19 track that on Southwestern Bell's side for its
20 parity?
21 MR. DYSART: I think that would be
22 one issue we'd have to work out. I don't
23 believe we track it from a parity perspective.
24 MR. SRINIVASA: So it may have to
25 be a benchmark?

1 they put into the bill? So --
2 MS. NELSON: Mr. Dysart is shaking
3 his head in agreement.
4 MR. DYSART: Yeah. This is
5 Southwestern Bell. I think we would -- at least
6 at cursory -- you know, from just listening to
7 what Pat had said, I think we would -- that
8 might be appropriate. I can't disagree.
9 MS. DILLARD: The same billing
10 group would be handling both. So, if we're
11 going to be manually tracking this, we'd be
12 tracking it for all.
13 MR. SRINIVASA: This is percent
14 claims not resolved the first time?
15 MS. DILLARD: The first time, yes.
16 MS. NELSON: Okay. And
17 Southwestern Bell is going to get back to us on
18 that. Let's move to 14.2.
19 MR. SIEGEL: Can I make one brief
20 comment? What we might want to consider -- if
21 we are going to do parity with ASI, in that
22 discussion, we might want to consider making it
23 Tier 1 low.
24 MR. DYSART: We'll consider that.
25 MS. NELSON: Okay. So Rhythms is

Page 77

1 going to redraft that and bring it to everybody
2 tomorrow morning, and then Southwestern Bell can
3 think about it and respond. 14.2. Let me start
4 with having Rhythms explain this.
5 MS. SOLIS: This really goes hand
6 in hand with 14.1. We also wanted to measure
7 them -- not just how many times we're having to
8 send bills back to be corrected, but how long it
9 takes from the receipt of the initial bill until
10 we actually get the corrected bill.
11 MR. SRINIVASA: So this is not a
12 second time. Regardless, any bill that you
13 send, how long does it take for them to correct
14 it?
15 MS. SOLIS: Right.
16 MS. DILLARD: This is Maria
17 Dillard, Southwestern Bell. It depends on the
18 contract, but for the most part we have 30 to 60
19 days, depending on the contract language, to
20 complete and resolve any billing claims that are
21 being provided. Are you thinking that we're
22 extending past that 30 to 60 days, or -- because
23 a lot of what takes place, which is why this
24 will be difficult to measure, is we will look at
25 a claim. We'll investigate it. We'll go back

Page 78

1 to the customer, and we'll talk it through that
2 we don't think it's incorrect. Maybe the
3 customer does. So there are some negotiations
4 that take place. So it's a very difficult
5 measure to look at, because we may ask the
6 customer to give us some more data, and that
7 goes back and forth. So --
8 MS. SOLIS: And I don't know that
9 that is always the case. In some of these that
10 we had to send back multiple times to be
11 corrected, I'd have to do a little bit of
12 research to find out if it actually did go back
13 past what's in the contract.
14 MS. DILLARD: Well, and I
15 understand the piece of duplication where if we
16 didn't correct it the first time. But on a
17 timing basis, too, once we receive the claim,
18 according to the contract, we have the 30 or 60
19 days to resolve it. If we have to pass it back
20 and deny it, that would be a close. But if we
21 come to an agreement with a customer that we
22 continue to work it, as we need more data from
23 them or they need more data from us, that may
24 extend past that, but it's a negotiated process
25 at that point.

Page 79

1 MS. NELSON: So are you saying
2 that it's difficult to measure because it's not
3 all the time attributable to Southwestern Bell?
4 MS. DILLARD: That's correct.
5 MS. NELSON: Okay.
6 MR. DRUMMOND: It appears that we
7 could talk about having an exclusion where it
8 was clearly CLEC originated problems, that those
9 could be excluded from the measure.
10 MS. NELSON: Okay. Would that all
11 be manual?
12 MS. DILLARD: Absolutely. And I
13 have some fear of that because then we have to
14 come to an agreement on what was or what wasn't,
15 and can we exclude this from the measurement? I
16 also am not sure, from working with our billing
17 group, that this is a real problem.
18 MS. NELSON: Right. I think from
19 a staff perspective, we'd like to see some
20 evidence that this is a problem before -- or
21 that people aren't getting what they need right
22 now before we start doing measures on stuff like
23 this that --
24 MR. SRINIVASA: Well, if the
25 correction process is manual, you are measuring

Page 80

1 performance of your manual process. You're not
2 correcting it automatically. It's not a
3 mechanized system to correct the bills.
4 MS. DILLARD: That's --
5 MR. SRINIVASA: The process of
6 correction is manual.
7 MS. DILLARD: That's true.
8 MR. SRINIVASA: So you're
9 measuring the performance of a manual process,
10 so the data collection would be manual, too,
11 naturally.
12 MR. DYSART: Can I ask one
13 question just to make sure I understand it? The
14 calculation -- if you send in a bill to correct
15 it, we send it back and say we've corrected it,
16 then you send one back and say, "No, it's not,"
17 is that a separate request, or is it -- or are
18 you asking that that be a continuation of the
19 previous, if that makes sense?
20 MS. SOLIS: That does make sense.
21 I believe that if we're having to send it back
22 because it still isn't correct, then it would
23 probably be a continuation.
24 MR. DYSART: So that would be one
25 event?

Page 81

Page 83

1 MS. SOLIS: Yes.
2 MS. NELSON: So it would be
3 measured twice. If you have both 14.1 and
4 14.2 --
5 MR. SRINIVASA: This is measuring
6 how long did it take for them to correct it.
7 What Southwestern Bell pointed out was that this
8 is a negotiation process. Sometimes CLECs take
9 longer to negotiate. And if CLECs take too long
10 a period of time for negotiating, they shouldn't
11 be penalized.
12 MS. NELSON: Right. I guess the
13 question is under 14.1, if it measures the
14 number of times -- how many bills they've had
15 that they send back more than once, and you
16 start with the first time that it's sent back
17 and you measure that from a timing standpoint,
18 then there's going to be a double penalization
19 unless --
20 MS. DILLARD: Right. The clock --
21 MS. NELSON: -- 14.1 is just
22 diagnostic.
23 MS. DILLARD: Right. If the clock
24 would continue in 14.2 -- if it was sent back
25 and it wasn't corrected, then we would take a

1 MR. SRINIVASA: Well, I'm trying
2 to understand. Are there two different harms if
3 there's bad performance? Does a CLEC suffer
4 harms differently, or is it the same harm?
5 MR. DRUMMOND: I think it's
6 initially considered -- the 14.1 was just a
7 diagnostic, so there's some difference there
8 capturing both the number of times and the
9 length of it so that we can at least try to
10 figure out what -- how problematic this was,
11 both on an individual time -- individual basis
12 and the length of time it's taken here so that
13 we can see if one or the other was something
14 that really needed to be captured and for which
15 performance needed to be affected.
16 MR. SRINIVASA: Mr. Siegel, you
17 were the one who proposed Tier 1 low, that being
18 the case.
19 MR. SIEGEL: And in part, that's
20 because we don't know if the Commission is going
21 to adopt both measures. If both measures are
22 adopted, I think there would be two ways to
23 handle it. One would be to probably make 14.1
24 diagnostic again. The other would be to have
25 the situation where if something is sent in a

Page 82

Page 84

1 hit in 14.1 and 14.2.
2 MS. NELSON: Right.
3 MR. SRINIVASA: Are those two
4 different acts of bad performance, then? One
5 you're measuring the frequency, and the other
6 you're measuring the time. Are you saying that
7 now it happens too many times for CLECs in
8 comparison to what happens to their affiliate,
9 therefore that is a bad performance? In other
10 words, it took longer than -- is this a parity
11 also? It took longer than usual -- longer than
12 what it took for their affiliate, therefore this
13 is different breach of performance?
14 MS. SOLIS: Right. And I think
15 that's why the tiers are different as well. On
16 14.1, it shows Tier 1 and Tier 2 as none. But
17 when it --
18 MS. NELSON: But Mr. Siegel
19 proposed making it a Tier 1 low.
20 MR. DRUMMOND: I think that 14.1,
21 Your Honor -- 14.1 and 14.2 can be dealt with
22 together, to the extent that there's a change on
23 the measurement types so that it's a Tier 1 low.
24 If we've got something beyond diagnostic, then a
25 similar change should be considered for 14.2.

1 repeated time, calculate it as multiple events
2 as opposed to one event, under the theory that
3 you're getting the multiple nature of it in
4 14.1, and you're looking at time to clear
5 repeated times separately in 14.2. Either way,
6 I think you would address the duplicativeness.
7 MR. COWLISHAW: A couple of
8 things. One if -- we were talking in the
9 abstract a moment ago about comparisons to ASI.
10 If that actually becomes a reality, I think we
11 probably need to understand a lot more about
12 exactly what billing goes on over there and
13 whether there's, in fact, something comparable
14 to measure. So that might work, and it might
15 not. I just wanted to get that out.
16 I guess the harms of 14.1 and 14.2
17 could be distinct. I think from our
18 perspective, probably, 14.1 how frequently it's
19 a problem that they don't get it fixed is
20 maybe -- it sounds like it's the more material,
21 though delay could become a problem. The thing
22 I wanted to say was we have now -- maybe to get
23 to a more manageable measure, focused on a
24 fairly limited category of the problem, which is
25 how often don't they correct the problem once

Page 85

1 it's brought to their attention. And what 14
2 was trying to get at -- or I guess the focus of
3 14 and billing accuracy is, you know, how often
4 does the bill come to us correct? And AT&T has
5 had a concern that the way the audit works --
6 that the information provided under 14 is
7 difficult to get much out of. And so in that
8 degree, we've got some sympathy with the
9 proposal to eliminate 14.
10 The challenge has been how do you get
11 some good information about billing accuracy
12 that can be collected in a manageable way? 14.1
13 or 14.2 are only going to get to a fraction of
14 that problem, and I don't think we -- what to do
15 about 14, I think we'd like to leave in advance
16 until we kind of get through the billing
17 measures and know what we really have and don't
18 have in terms of information.
19 But it's our understanding that since
20 January or sometime around then, Southwestern
21 Bell has begun to do some kind of trending or
22 tracking of billing issues or billing
23 problems -- something Julie Chambers, who we're
24 trying to get on the phone, has told me. I
25 don't know much more detail than that, and I

Page 86

1 don't know whether over the next six months that
2 might be information that could be available to
3 the CLECs and provide a basis for recommending
4 either no more measure or a different measure
5 when we go to the next six-month review, if
6 we're getting rid of 14.
7 MS. DILLARD: I'm not familiar
8 with what you're talking about, so I apologize.
9 Of course, we have started looking at our
10 claims. That may be part of what you're looking
11 at. And that would be exactly what we'd have to
12 do in order to make 14.1 as a measure, so -- but
13 other than that, I'm not familiar with -- of
14 course, as y'all mentioned, certification bills.
15 Certification is something that we're doing with
16 AT&T in particular, so that has been tracked and
17 has been looked at.
18 MS. NELSON: Okay. Since -- let's
19 go through the rest of the measures, and then
20 I'd be interested, once we're done with all of
21 them and having the CLECs work with Southwestern
22 Bell, given the discussion we've had today, to
23 try to come to some agreement on the measures.
24 MR. DYSART: PM 15, I think we
25 broke that down into two measures, 15 and 15.1,

Page 87

1 for EDI, and then for the BDT process.
2 MS. NELSON: And there's
3 agreement?
4 MR. DYSART: I don't think at the
5 time we talked about them there was
6 disagreement. I'm not going to go as far as to
7 say there was agreement.
8 MR. SRINIVASA: Do you need to
9 separate them out as two different measures, or
10 can that be a disaggregation?
11 MR. DYSART: I think it could be a
12 disaggregation. It would just be two
13 separate --
14 MR. SRINIVASA: The business rules
15 are different or just --
16 MR. DYSART: They're a little bit
17 different. But, I mean, whether we do them in
18 one or two, it doesn't matter to me. There
19 would still be a disaggregation, so --
20 MS. FETTIG: Yeah, I think you
21 could word it where you'd have one measure and
22 disaggregate it.
23 MR. DYSART: We could do that.
24 MS. NELSON: Okay. Does anyone
25 oppose the way 15 and 15.1, as we've just

Page 88

1 discussed it, will be handled?
2 MR. SIEGEL: Howard Siegel, IP
3 Communications. I think this is probably just a
4 clerical oversight. In 15.1, in the report
5 structure, the SWBT affiliate is included. It's
6 not listed in 15. I realize the SWBT affiliate
7 is probably only going to be doing one or the
8 other, but to cover it, it should probably be in
9 the report structure in both.
10 MR. DYSART: We'll put it in there
11 as where applicable.
12 MR. SIEGEL: Great.
13 MS. NELSON: Okay. And so
14 Southwestern Bell will modify this, and it will
15 go out on Monday also?
16 MR. DYSART: Probably Tuesday.
17 MS. NELSON: Okay. To the extent
18 that -- it looks like there's agreement on this,
19 so it wouldn't be something you would need to
20 discuss with everybody else, I'm assuming.
21 MS. FETTIG: Yeah. This is Eva
22 Fettig from AT&T. I just have one
23 clarification. If a count of accurate and
24 complete, the mechanized bills, is that one bill
25 pulled in a month or one -- if you miss it for

Page 89

Page 91

1 one -- all the bills pulled in that month, is
2 that one?
3 MS. DILLARD: I believe it's
4 whatever is in that particular transmission.
5 MS. FETTIG: Okay. Got it.
6 MR. SRINIVASA: I see some
7 historic information on this. Apparently I see
8 that for the 12-month total, you're at 99.98
9 percent, almost at 100 percent. So that being
10 the case, do we need to apply critical Z
11 allowance for this?
12 MR. DYSART: Would it be okay if I
13 just came back and gave you a blanket answer to
14 all of these?
15 (Laughter)
16 MS. NELSON: Okay.
17 MR. SRINIVASA: Okay.
18 MS. NELSON: So you're just going
19 to incorporate that within whatever you provide
20 to us on Monday and Tuesday?
21 MR. DYSART: Correct.
22 MS. NELSON: As each of the
23 benchmarks?
24 MR. DYSART: All the benchmarks.
25 Right.

1 it was -- and pursuing why it was that no data
2 had been reported under this measure for AT&T
3 and some other folks for some time, it was
4 because we came to understand that the UNE
5 billing was not being tracked under existing
6 Performance Measure 15. BDT, I understand, has
7 been added as a disaggregation. Now we're going
8 to make it in order to get that UNE. And I just
9 want to confirm whether there are any other tape
10 formats that CLECs use or can use for billing
11 that if somebody starts using one, we're not
12 going to have a situation where they fall
13 outside the performance measures.
14 MR. DYSART: Well, to our
15 knowledge, this is in two ways. But if somebody
16 else knows of another way --
17 MS. DILLARD: This is Maria
18 Dillard. The only other way that currently
19 CLECs receive bills is via paper. Now, Pat, I
20 think what we talked about last time was in the
21 event a new type of electronic feed is developed
22 or is added, we certainly can go back and take a
23 look at that.
24 MR. DYSART: And I can add that to
25 the business rule.

Page 90

Page 92

1 MS. NELSON: Okay. And make sure
2 you distinguish -- I mean, as a concept, it
3 would seem like critical Z should be applied or
4 not be applied for benchmarks. So, if you're
5 suggesting it should not be applied or applied,
6 whatever, it would be -- staff would be
7 interested in the rationale.
8 MR. DYSART: Okay.
9 MR. SRINIVASA: Certain -- not
10 across the board. What we're trying to do is
11 certain situations where we have enough historic
12 data, and if the benchmark is set right,
13 should --
14 MR. DYSART: Right.
15 MR. SRINIVASA: And if we're not
16 sure if the benchmark is not correct, I think we
17 want to retain that still, or if there's a new
18 benchmark established, we want to retain that.
19 MR. DYSART: I agree, essentially.
20 MS. NELSON: Okay. Performance
21 Measure 16.
22 MR. COWLISHAW: I'm sorry. We
23 got -- I just need to get one clarification.
24 The reason this EDI/BDT suggestion came about
25 was because in the course of doing this review,

1 MS. DILLARD: These are the two.
2 MR. COWLISHAW: Let's do that.
3 MS. NELSON: Okay. Are we ready
4 to move on to 16? I see a number of changes to
5 this measure, but I don't see any disagreements
6 stated. So does that mean that Southwestern
7 Bell and the CLECs have agreed to the
8 modifications?
9 MR. DYSART: I think this -- the
10 changes here are as a result of one of our
11 earlier meetings. I don't know that we had
12 actually gotten any feedback yet from the CLECs
13 on that.
14 MS. NELSON: Okay. Do any of the
15 CLECs have questions or comments regarding the
16 Southwestern Bell modifications?
17 MR. COWLISHAW: On 16?
18 MS. NELSON: Yes.
19 MR. COWLISHAW: Yes. The
20 exclusion for 01 records, can Southwestern Bell
21 clarify whether that is limited to records for
22 which the 01 is in the first two digits? And
23 the reason for the question is, for example,
24 there's something like ten 01-01 records, which
25 we think should be kind of what you'd be

Page 93

1 covering -- or part of what you'd be covering in
2 here and which are not third-party generated
3 records. So, when our people saw the 01
4 reference, they were all of a sudden wondering
5 how broad exactly what it is that we're being
6 excluded here.

7 MR. LOCUS: This is John Locus
8 with Southwestern Bell. Category 01 would be
9 the first two positions of the EMI record type.
10 And 01 would be rated EMI records.

11 MR. SRINIVASA: You may want to
12 modify -- state that.

13 MR. LOCUS: So the other records
14 would be the Category 10, the R-10 01 records.
15 But the second position not commonly referred to
16 as the category, we could go through and clarify
17 it would be the first two positions of the EMI
18 record.

19 MS. NELSON: And the same would be
20 true for Category 11 records?

21 MR. LOCUS: Yes, ma'am. That
22 would be the first two positions of the EMI
23 record.

24 MR. COWLISHAW: And kind of a
25 follow onto that, AT&T at least had an

Page 94

1 experience last fall -- I don't know if we have
2 folks here familiar with it -- when 01-01-31s
3 were sent to us in error, and that was an issue
4 of billing -- or usage record accuracy. And we
5 were getting records that we shouldn't have been
6 sent, and it caused some kind of problems.
7 Again, I apologize Julie can't be with us at the
8 moment to say more what it was. But that seemed
9 to her, at least, to be an instance of an 01
10 type usage record being sent to AT&T when it
11 shouldn't have been sent and would be kind of --
12 the kind of instance of a usage record
13 inaccuracy or us getting the wrong usage records
14 that we would want to capture in a type measure
15 that's being proposed here under 16.

16 MR. LOCUS: This is John Locus
17 with Southwestern Bell. Yeah, we agree that
18 those records should be captured. In the
19 wording here, we tried to identify that it would
20 only be 01 records that came (inaudible) to a
21 CLEC. It would not be those records originated
22 by Southwestern Bell. If what that -- the
23 phrase which says, "provided by other companies
24 for SWBT to transmit," that's what that was
25 intended to mean was only those records that are

Page 95

1 coming from other local companies -- or other
2 companies that SWBT passed through.

3 MR. COWLISHAW: And is -- the
4 01-01-31s would be something that SWBT itself
5 actually generated?

6 MR. LOCUS: Yes. John Locus with
7 Southwestern Bell. In the particular case
8 you're talking about, those were records that
9 Southwestern Bell had generated in error and had
10 been transmitted to AT&T in this case. So I
11 believe the wording here was not meant to
12 exclude any records that would have been
13 reported and generated by Southwestern Bell. It
14 would only be those records that were sent to us
15 by another company. And since we don't have any
16 control over those companies, we didn't want to
17 be held responsible for the accuracy of their
18 records.

19 MS. NELSON: Okay. With that
20 explanation, Mr. Cowlshaw, does that language
21 need to be modified, or with the explanation is
22 it clear?

23 MR. COWLISHAW: I think with the
24 explanation I'm okay with that, but it's a
25 helpful explanation.

Page 96

1 MS. NELSON: Are there any other
2 concerns or comments about the modifications in
3 this measure?

4 MR. COWLISHAW: I think the
5 general concern or -- the way we're trying to
6 evaluate this proposal -- AT&T has just begun, I
7 guess -- is in testing right now on the use of
8 this extract return process -- return file
9 process, and hopefully out of that testing
10 process we're going to get a feel for how -- how
11 easy this is to use and how well it works. I
12 don't have any idea the level with which CLECs
13 are -- other CLECs may be testing or using this
14 process already. It seems like a step in the
15 direction of getting a way for us to actually be
16 able to get a usage record accuracy, but -- and
17 I think this comes up in one of the other
18 database measures where we do it on a CLEC
19 complaint basis or a CLEC return of records
20 basis. And the reality out there is we have a
21 large number of folks who aren't participating
22 in the process, and then you're left to try and
23 make a judgment about what the data really
24 means. I don't know if it would make sense
25 to -- if this is done, to do it on the basis

Page 97

Page 99

1 of -- you know, when you aggregate up the CLEC
2 data, you would really only use data from CLECs
3 who are somehow participating in the process
4 rather than the entire universe of usage records
5 that are transmitted by Southwestern Bell. But
6 that is a concern.

7 The -- the other -- the way the rule is
8 written -- and I think it's just kind of a first
9 draft -- is the CLEC returns this record using
10 this process, claims inaccuracy. And the way
11 the rule is written, then Southwestern Bell
12 makes a determination do they agree. If they
13 agree, they count it against themselves. If
14 they don't agree, then they don't. And there
15 needs to be some way that that becomes kind of a
16 two-way street.

17 So, if Southwestern Bell says, "Gee, we
18 think it was accurate," maybe there would be a
19 requirement in here that they return that
20 information to the CLEC. And obviously, there
21 could be a potential for dispute resolution.
22 Hopefully it doesn't all come to that. But it's
23 written in a way that Southwestern Bell kind of
24 makes a discretionary determination, and that's
25 the end of the measure. So I think you'd want

1 We're going to take that off. And then we still
2 have -- I guess the basic issue, then, is parity
3 versus benchmark on this one. Southwestern Bell
4 is requesting a benchmark of 98 percent, and I
5 think the CLECs are still requesting parity.

6 MR. SRINIVASA: Can the CLECs
7 explain why it should be parity -- of course
8 parity is what's there now. Tell me why you
9 disagree with Southwestern Bell that it
10 shouldn't be a benchmark. Of course, they're
11 not going to apply the critical Z value to it.

12 (No response)

13 MS. NELSON: Is there any CLEC
14 that wants to address this?

15 MR. SIEGEL: I guess from our
16 perspective --

17 MS. NELSON: Could you stand up,
18 Mr. Siegel, just so the --

19 MR. SIEGEL: Howard Siegel, IP
20 Communications. I guess from our perspective --
21 and maybe for other data providers, I guess --
22 I'm assuming that Southwestern Bell's proposal
23 to move away from parity with SWBT retail had at
24 least something to do with the fact of maybe the
25 difficulty of pulling the retail data. I'm not

Page 98

Page 100

1 to add some language -- we could propose some --
2 for how to address that part of it.

3 MS. NELSON: I guess what staff
4 would like would be for AT&T and any other CLEC
5 who's interested in, you know, either -- what
6 would be the best -- the ideal situation would
7 be for y'all to get together off-line. But if
8 that's not possible, if you could come back with
9 some language, like, by tomorrow morning to give
10 to Southwestern Bell so that then Southwestern
11 Bell could respond.

12 MR. COWLISHAW: Okay.

13 MS. NELSON: But in the meantime,
14 if you want to talk about abstract concepts with
15 them, it might be helpful.

16 MR. COWLISHAW: We'll try to stop
17 talking about abstract concepts with you, then.

18 (Laughter)

19 MS. NELSON: Okay. Is there
20 anything else on 16?

21 (No response)

22 MS. NELSON: Okay. No. 17?

23 MR. DYSART: 17, I think we had
24 one correction that -- late posting of orders
25 due to rates not yet agreed to as an exclusion.

1 100 percent sure. If that's the case, that
2 doesn't really apply with ASI. And so I'm
3 just -- I don't know if IP has a hard position
4 either way, but I guess I would be a little bit
5 interested in exactly why the benchmark was
6 proposed and whether that philosophy is -- has
7 to do with ASI.

8 MR. SRINIVASA: ASI --

9 MR. SIEGEL: As being a parity
10 comparison for data providers.

11 MS. NELSON: Could somebody
12 respond?

13 MR. DYSART: I'll try to address
14 Mr. Siegel's comments. Basically, the reason
15 that we felt like it was appropriate to move the
16 benchmark is when we're comparing retail, retail
17 uses the CRIS billing system, where obviously
18 when we go to the CLECs, it's a combination of
19 CRIS and CABS. So there's inherently some
20 differences there. And the performance you can
21 see over the past several months has been very
22 good. In fact, even the times we were out of
23 parity, it was well -- it was 98 percent or
24 better. So the sample sizes in here are so
25 great with those combination of things I just

Page 101

1 addressed, it's very difficult, if not some
2 months impossible, to meet parity on that. You
3 could be off by a slight amount from retail, and
4 it's a miss. So we felt that -- 98 percent is
5 still outstanding service, and we felt that that
6 inherently gave the CLEC an opportunity to
7 compete, considering that it's two different
8 billing systems.

9 As far as the ASI issue -- I mean,
10 obviously we would provide this information for
11 ASI as well --

12 MR. SIEGEL: IP Communications. I
13 think we can accept the benchmark 98 percent, so
14 long as we add ASI to the report structure. And
15 then if in six months there's a difference
16 between what ASI is receiving and what we're
17 receiving, then we might request a change in the
18 benchmark to parity with ASI at that time.

19 MR. DYSART: From our perspective,
20 we're fine with that.

21 MR. SRINIVASA: Other comments
22 from other CLECs on this, getting rid of the
23 parity standard and replacing that with 98
24 percent benchmark with no critical Z?

25 MR. SAUDER: This is T.J. Sauder

Page 102

1 with Birch. It seems to me that we're dealing
2 with posting of service orders, and they both --
3 both the retail side and UNE side both post
4 using the same process, whether the billing
5 system is the same or not I think is almost
6 irrelevant. But why should -- why shouldn't it
7 be comparing at parity, because it's the same
8 process? It's the same comparison.

9 MR. DYSART: Well, I guess from
10 our perspective it really isn't the same in CRIS
11 and CABS. But besides that point, I think the
12 problem that we have is if retail is at 99
13 percent, and we're at 98.9 percent for the
14 CLECs, is that out of parity? Does that really
15 affect your opportunity to compete? Does the
16 customer on the other end notice the difference
17 that would harm you in gaining customers in the
18 future? I think the answer, in our opinion, is
19 clearly no. So it just needs to be -- since it
20 isn't apples to apples, there is a difference
21 there, I think a benchmark in this case is more
22 appropriate.

23 MS. NELSON: Do any other CLECs
24 have comments?

25 MS. FETTIG: This is Eva Fettig

Page 103

1 from AT&T. I guess -- we could support the
2 benchmark. I'm looking at the order volume, and
3 at roughly 300,000 orders in a given month, it
4 seems to me that 1 percent is probably more
5 generous versus the 2. And I think that's 3,000
6 misses -- you know, that's a lot of customers in
7 Texas. And it seems to me that -- I wouldn't
8 want to go on record supporting, you know, what
9 I consider 2 percent is bad behavior. I would
10 like to see us, you know, think about the end
11 users who are, you know, getting affected by
12 that. I think we could all do ourselves a
13 service to make sure that, you know, we keep
14 customers in mind.

15 MS. NELSON: So you're saying
16 2 percent is inappropriate?

17 MS. FETTIG: I think 1 percent is
18 probably enough to -- it's 3,000 orders. I
19 mean, that's a lot to say that it's okay to
20 miss. I think 6,000 is too much.

21 MS. NELSON: So you want to
22 benchmark them at 99 percent?

23 MR. COWLISHAW: If you wanted to
24 switch to --

25 MS. FETTIG: Yeah, if you'd like

Page 104

1 to switch to the benchmark.

2 MR. SRINIVASA: Well, if you look
3 at the data that's reported for 17.01, for
4 Southwestern Bell, the 12-month average is at
5 98.9 percent, close to 99. But if the order
6 volume is so high, can we go with the 98.5
7 percent? It's less than 99 even for them.

8 MS. EMCH: This is Marsha Emch
9 with WorldCom. Looking at the past 12 month's
10 data, I think -- and using your proposal, Nara,
11 that we would pass the 98.5 percent the last 12
12 months, we would support that benchmark over the
13 parity.

14 MR. SRINIVASA: With no critical Z
15 allowance?

16 MS. EMCH: Uh-huh.

17 MS. NELSON: Would Southwestern
18 Bell agree to that?

19 MR. DYSART: One moment. Could we
20 take this off-line to lunch?

21 MS. NELSON: Okay. Sure. Come
22 back after lunch. Okay. Let's move on to -- it
23 looks like that's the only major dispute. Did
24 we answer the question of "Does this measure
25 include wholesale orders CLEC or end user?"

Page 105

Page 107

1 MR. DYSART: I'm sorry?
2 MS. NELSON: There was another
3 issue listed. "Does this measure include
4 wholesale orders CLEC or end user?"
5 MR. DYSART: I believe we said it
6 was the CLEC's bill, and we clarified that in
7 the definition.
8 MS. NELSON: Okay. Thank you.
9 Okay. Then let's move on and have AT&T explain
10 17.1.
11 MR. DYSART: We have a
12 counterproposal to that, if we'd like to pass
13 that out at the same time, and then AT&T could
14 explain that or whatever -- however you would
15 like to handle that.
16 MS. NELSON: Okay. Why don't we
17 have them explain this first, and then we'll
18 have --
19 MR. COWLISHAW: The -- starting
20 right where you left off, the -- as I
21 understand, when we say that existing Measure 17
22 is tied to posting prior to the CLEC's bill
23 period, what that -- what that means is that
24 17 -- an order can be completed, can fail to
25 post for up to 30 days, and still not be

1 business days. I'll kind of let Southwestern
2 Bell maybe address their counter.
3 MR. DYSART: Okay. Well, as he
4 passes that out, let me try and kind of explain
5 what we tried to do with this. It's similar to
6 some of the other measurements we talked about.
7 But we would want to take this and look at --
8 since this is a percentage measurement, what
9 percent of the orders posted at the 80th
10 percentile, so what number of days did it take
11 to do that. And we're proposing like an 85
12 percentile, 90, 95, just to see how many days
13 typically would fall into those categories.
14 MR. COWLISHAW: Is this actually a
15 new modification from what you passed out
16 yesterday?
17 MR. DYSART: Yes, it is.
18 MR. COWLISHAW: Oh, okay.
19 MR. DYSART: Because we took those
20 concerns that y'all had. The one change that we
21 would have to do different than what AT&T
22 suggested, at least for this interim period, is
23 we'd have to base this on the posting date for a
24 particular month so that we could tell -- take
25 the posting date minus the completion date and

Page 106

Page 108

1 captured or count against Southwestern Bell's
2 performance in -- in existing PM 17. And so for
3 all the reasons we've talked about in the past
4 related to consequences of posting delay, we
5 have proposed a measure that would -- that would
6 get at what we think is the more appropriate
7 target interval for posting, which would be five
8 business days following service order
9 completion.
10 We had some discussion about this at
11 the end of the day yesterday in our informal
12 workshop, and that relates to the
13 counterproposal that Southwestern Bell will
14 bring. But I thought we were moving in the
15 direction of hopefully measuring, at least on a
16 diagnostic basis -- we actually proposed 17.1 to
17 displace 17 -- if our 17.1 was accepted, then
18 there wouldn't be a need for 17. And in that
19 context, you would want it to be subject to the
20 remedy plan. I think we're prepared, for
21 purposes of trying to move forward, to deal with
22 17 along the lines we just finished discussing
23 and put 17.1 in place as a diagnostic. And
24 there I think we would want to get data on how
25 many of the orders are coming back within five

1 see how many orders fell into that category and
2 see what percentiles they fell into. That
3 doesn't mean that after we gathered the data
4 that we couldn't go back and collect it in a
5 manner that AT&T proposed. We're not saying
6 that by looking at the completion date as y'all
7 described. But this way, if we look at a
8 posting date for a particular month, we can
9 capture how long things take and kind of get a
10 distribution of that so we can see what might be
11 appropriate in the future.
12 MS. NELSON: Mr. Cowlshaw, would
13 you like a chance to look at this and come back
14 to this after lunch?
15 MR. COWLISHAW: Yeah. And if we
16 want the explanation off-line, I can get it. I
17 didn't fully understand what you just said in
18 terms of the difference of what you're proposing
19 and what we proposed to calculate it.
20 MR. DYSART: Okay.
21 MR. COWLISHAW: Unless others feel
22 a need for that.
23 MR. WAKEFIELD: Jason Wakefield,
24 WorldCom. And we'll certainly also consider the
25 new proposal with regards to the overall

Page 109

1 structure of the rule. We had one issue that
2 isn't addressed by the proposal, and we may not
3 have raised it. I don't know if we did or not.
4 It was in the AT&T proposal, and that is, the
5 measurement would be disaggregated by order
6 type, which would include resale, UNE
7 combinations, xDSL, loops, other UNE.
8 What WorldCom is trying to do,
9 understanding that the Commission wants fewer
10 measurements rather than more, and also
11 understanding that after we proposed the LIDB
12 measurement that we've received information from
13 Southwestern Bell -- if we could get
14 confirmation, that would be very helpful -- that
15 the PICC in the LVAS, which is the LIDB
16 database, does not impact the customer. If that
17 information is correct, then that reduces some
18 of the concern that we had, obviously, on the
19 accuracy of the PICC and the LVAS. There still
20 would be some customer impact if there's
21 information in the LVAS that is not timely
22 processed, such as the ability to do third-party
23 calls, collect calls if there were changes. But
24 those are things we can address with
25 Southwestern Bell.

Page 110

1 What we were hoping to do is to use
2 this measurement, 17.1, to capture what we
3 understand is the root cause of the problems for
4 LIDB updates, and that is late posting of the
5 end order. So, to the extent we could at the
6 very least disaggregate 17.1 by UNE combination,
7 then we would know how many of our UNE-P orders
8 were posting late, how many were posting on
9 time, and presumably then know how many of the
10 LIDB updates were posting late or posting on
11 time. So it would be helpful if we could
12 disaggregate it by order types.

13 MS. NELSON: Do you have any
14 concern with that, Mr. Dysart, or do you agree
15 with that?

16 MR. DYSART: I have a concern, I
17 guess, that -- at the different levels of
18 interface, first of all, and then by order type.
19 It just creates a lot more levels of
20 disaggregation.

21 MR. WAKEFIELD: Randy, just to
22 clarify, what we were proposing is just by order
23 type. Other parties may be proposing by
24 interface. We were just proposing simply by
25 order type.

Page 111

1 MS. NELSON: And if you don't
2 disaggregate as Mr. Wakefield proposes, how
3 would you address his concern?

4 MR. DYSART: I beg your pardon? I
5 missed that.

6 MS. NELSON: If you don't
7 disaggregate as he's suggesting, how would you
8 address the concern regarding LIDB?

9 MR. DYSART: I'll have to take
10 that back at lunch. Our LIDB person is back at
11 the office.

12 MS. DILLARD: Right. This is
13 Maria Dillard. The LIDB concern that MCI had
14 had -- WorldCom had had, we did address, and it
15 does not impact the PICC. And that was
16 clarified, and that is confirmed. The levels
17 of disaggregation -- that is not something -- I
18 mean, the CRIS system, the CABS system, the
19 products that are flowing through there, once
20 they hit those systems, they're posting
21 basically the same way. We have certain
22 situations that do not allow the order to post,
23 and they're the same situations whether it's in
24 a UNE combination, UNE loop, resale, et cetera.
25 There are certain situations such as a bill

Page 112

1 pull. If an order is trying to post at the same
2 time the bill pull is being taken, the order,
3 whether it's a UNE combo or UNE loop, cannot
4 post. So there's a time frame there that it is
5 held back.

6 In addition to that, we have some
7 sequencing on posting, but this is not specific
8 to UNE combinations or UNE loops, et cetera.
9 The D order has to post before the N order. So,
10 if a service rep is trying to make -- if
11 something falls out for them to work the
12 activity, they have to go in and look at the
13 relationship of the orders, make one post. Then
14 that batch cycle that evening will allow that to
15 take place. Then the next day, they would go in
16 and type the next piece of the order. That's
17 the way the process works regardless of the type
18 of activity that's taking place. So that
19 particularly indicates why there is a delay in
20 any posting, and it's the same regardless of the
21 product.

22 MR. SAUDER: This is T.J. Sauder
23 with Birch. You said that's not unique to the
24 UNE combination, the three-order process. When
25 would that -- I mean, obviously it happens -- on

Page 113

1 a straight conversion, it happens every time for
2 a UNE combination. I don't know -- is there
3 examples that you have when that happens on the
4 retail side?
5 MS. DILLARD: Well, certainly in a
6 resale environment. If you have a new connect
7 or disconnect, it's the same thing.
8 MR. SAUDER: The resale --
9 MS. DILLARD: The D order would --
10 not on a conversion, but on any situation, if
11 you're having a retail customer moved over and
12 you're new connecting and disconnecting, the D
13 has to post before the N can post. So it's the
14 same thing. It's a sequencing. So there's no
15 difference there.
16 MR. WAKEFIELD: If I may respond.
17 What WorldCom is trying to do is eliminate the
18 need for a LIDB specific measurement by
19 capturing it here. And to the extent you have a
20 much higher level of aggregation, you may miss
21 problems with LIDB updates that could be
22 specific to the LIDB process by putting it into
23 this bigger pot of order types. So what we are
24 really trying to do is to use Measurement 17.1
25 to measure the late posting problem that we have

Page 114

1 identified for UNE-P orders. And to the extent
2 we can disaggregate it at that basis, we could
3 withdraw our -- Measurement 122, I think it
4 was -- the LIDB specific measurement. But if we
5 don't disaggregate by UNE-P, then we would
6 re-urge the LIDB specific measurement.
7 MS. NELSON: Okay. Mr. Cowlshaw,
8 did you want to get any other clarification on
9 the measure, or --
10 MS. FETTIG: This is Eva Fettig
11 from AT&T. I just had one question. Randy, I
12 was trying to copy down when you were talking
13 about the calculation, and I guess my one
14 clarifying question is are you starting from the
15 total number of posted orders or the total
16 number of completed orders when you're proposing
17 this measurement?
18 MR. DYSART: For the purposes of
19 this, we would have to use the posted so that we
20 know -- so that we could calculate everything
21 that had happened and occurred. Now, when
22 you -- at such time as you came up with a
23 benchmark or whatever, then you could go the
24 other direction that y'all wanted to. But for
25 the purposes of studying it, I think you have to

Page 115

1 go with what's posted.
2 MS. FETTIG: Yeah. And I think
3 that's kind of contrary to the spirit of what we
4 were kind of thinking that -- trying to get at,
5 which is trying to get a measure of those
6 completed orders that are taking a long time to
7 post, and so rather than taking all of the
8 posted orders and measuring how long it took for
9 them to post. So --
10 MR. DYSART: My dilemma, though,
11 with trying to do it at several different
12 levels -- say the five, ten, 15 days -- is the
13 way you describe it here, I'd have to have
14 different data collection periods to be able to
15 do that. So, if I want to get multiple reads of
16 it, I need to base it on something that's final.
17 And the only thing in this case that's final is
18 posting. Once I determine what the
19 appropriate -- whether it's five, ten, whatever
20 it may be -- then you could go to a data
21 collection process as you describe. But if you
22 notice here, your data collection period backs
23 up -- in this case, we've made it to where it's
24 like ten days from the end of the month, so you
25 knew on a completion it would have time to post.

Page 116

1 And then you did the evaluation there. But if I
2 look at a five-day interval or a ten-day
3 interval, that data collection period may not be
4 exactly the same.
5 So just for the purposes of studying
6 what's the appropriate benchmark, all I'm
7 saying here is where posting is more
8 appropriate. Once that's done, then I'm not
9 necessarily objecting to going to a process that
10 you're talking about. But I have to know if
11 it's going to be a five-day or a ten-day
12 interval. And you're still comparing the
13 completion to posting. It's just the time --
14 MR. COWLISHAW: But you're leaving
15 out each month those ones that haven't yet
16 posted.
17 MR. DYSART: And they'll be picked
18 up the following month.
19 MR. NOLAND: The base -- this is
20 Brian Noland. The base would be the total
21 number of orders that post within the reporting
22 month. And at that point, you would do your
23 comparison.
24 MR. DYSART: And I can talk about
25 this off-line with you and maybe --

Page 117

1 MS. NELSON: Okay. And then
2 AT&T, you can give them whatever information
3 they need, and they can report back this
4 afternoon as to what --
5 MR. SAUDER: I'd like to make one
6 comment, if I can. T.J. Sauder with Birch
7 Telecom. We're interested in actually having
8 this measure replace 17 and actually having more
9 timely posting. As far as gathering historical
10 data, we went through this process in
11 Docket 21000 with Birch and Southwestern Bell
12 and staff. And also, I believe this would be
13 very simple to pull historical data on this.
14 The two fields are already captured when the
15 orders post, when the work completes and when it
16 actually posts. And I think it would be very
17 simple to pull the historical data and find how
18 long it takes orders to post.
19 MS. NELSON: Okay. So, after
20 lunch, I think we'd be interested in hearing
21 your comments to the AT&T and Southwestern Bell
22 proposals. So you might get with them also.
23 MR. SAUDER: Okay.
24 MS. NELSON: Any other CLECs,
25 obviously, are invited to do the same.

Page 118

1 Okay. We're going to go ahead and take
2 a lunch break right now, and then we'll come
3 back and finish the billing measures before we
4 move on to the other measures that were
5 scheduled for today.
6 MR. SRINIVASA: We're coming back
7 at 1:10.
8 (Lunch recess at 12:10 p.m.)
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Page 119

1 AFTERNOON SESSION
2 THURSDAY JUNE 8, 2000
3 (1:32 p.m.)
4 MS. NELSON: Okay. Let's go ahead
5 and go back on the record. We were on PM 18.
6 It looks like there was a minor change to that.
7 Is there agreement on PM 18?
8 MR. DYSART: Yeah. The change,
9 really, on 18 and 18.1 is similar to 15 and
10 15.1. It's just basically breaking it out by
11 BDT and EDI.
12 MS. NELSON: Okay. Does anybody
13 have questions?
14 MR. SIEGEL: Howard Siegel, IP
15 Communications.
16 MS. NELSON: Would you stand up,
17 Mr. Siegel?
18 MR. SIEGEL: Howard Siegel, IP
19 Communications. Just the same comment on the
20 report structure that was made on the prior set.
21 MR. DYSART: And Southwestern Bell
22 is fine with that.
23 MR. SAUDER: I have a question.
24 T.J. Sauder with Birch Telecom. On 18.1, we
25 have had, in the near past, problems with

Page 120

1 reading the bill tapes that are sent to us, and
2 it seems to me that we -- asking if we could
3 build in a time period there where if we have
4 problems with the quality of tape or reading the
5 tape, that that could somehow be worked into
6 18.1. So, if there's a problem with the actual
7 tape that's sent, that it can be -- that time
8 included to resolve those problems.
9 MS. DILLARD: This is Maria
10 Dillard. I believe when that type of situation
11 has ever occurred, you're allowed at least an
12 extension in paying the bills. So wouldn't that
13 be kind of redundant? Of course, that's if it's
14 proved that there was a true transmission
15 problem.
16 MR. SAUDER: This one measures the
17 time -- makes sure the bills are sent on time.
18 MS. DILLARD: Right.
19 MR. SAUDER: But if you can't read
20 it -- if the CLEC can't read it, then there's
21 obviously --
22 MS. DILLARD: I'm not sure how
23 often that has happened or if it's a real
24 problem, but like I said, you're allowed extra
25 time period, if that's been proven, to pay your

Page 121

1 bill. So is it really necessary that we have to
2 put a --
3 MR. SAUDER: It's not a big issue,
4 but I -- I don't know. We can probably take it
5 off-line and discuss if we can work that out
6 or -- it's probably not --
7 MS. DILLARD: Okay.
8 MS. NELSON: Okay. That would be
9 good. Then let's move on to --
10 MR. COWLISHAW: Can I just confirm
11 one thing?
12 MS. NELSON: Sure.
13 MR. COWLISHAW: The existing
14 measure didn't refer to either EDI or BDT, but
15 what we're doing here is -- but the way it's
16 been implemented has been only EDI to date. Is
17 that --
18 MR. DYSART: I believe that's
19 correct.
20 MR. COWLISHAW: And are we going
21 to do this one on the basis that we did the
22 other one, actually put them both in one
23 measure?
24 MR. DYSART: Correct. And then
25 I'll add any electronic interface in the future.

Page 122

1 MR. SRINIVASA: Disaggregation?
2 MR. DYSART: Yeah.
3 MS. NELSON: Okay. And you'll
4 have that to us by Monday?
5 MR. DYSART: Tuesday.
6 (Laughter)
7 MS. NELSON: Okay.
8 MR. SRINIVASA: 19.
9 MS. NELSON: 19, it looks like
10 this has been agreed to.
11 MR. SRINIVASA: Daily usage feed
12 timeliness.
13 MS. NELSON: Was there something
14 changed about this?
15 MR. DYSART: I think it's the
16 same.
17 MS. NELSON: Okay. And 20 --
18 MR. SRINIVASA: Let me ask -- all
19 other measures you've got are within six work
20 days. For 19, are you still keeping it --
21 MR. DYSART: Well, this is a
22 timeliness, so I think this one is appropriate.
23 MR. SRINIVASA: You're going to
24 still keep it?
25 MR. DYSART: Right.

Page 123

1 MR. COWLISHAW: 18 still has it.
2 MR. DYSART: Yeah.
3 MR. SRINIVASA: Oh, 18 still has
4 it. Sorry.
5 MS. NELSON: Okay. 20, everyone
6 agreed to eliminate that?
7 MR. SRINIVASA: Okay.
8 MR. COWLISHAW: 20 you were going
9 to confirm, I think, for the record that this
10 unbillable usage data is something that
11 Southwestern Bell continues to collect for its
12 own purposes and would be available on kind of a
13 request basis for somebody to look at it.
14 MR. DYSART: That's correct. We
15 do collect it, and it would be available if
16 someone wanted it for a special study.
17 MS. NELSON: Okay. Is this the
18 appropriate time, then, to go back and look at
19 14, 14.1, and how those all fit together?
20 MR. DRUMMOND: Your Honor, Eric
21 Drummond. If we do need to do that, the Rhythms
22 supplement expert has left for the day. I
23 believe she's working on that set of --
24 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, Eric. I
25 can't hear you.

Page 124

1 MR. DRUMMOND: The Rhythms subject
2 matter experiment has left for the day and would
3 not be available today to participate in those
4 discussions for 14, 14.1, and 14.2 if we needed
5 to go back over it.
6 MS. NELSON: Okay. Well, let me
7 just ask if there are any overview comments
8 anybody would like to make in terms of
9 discussions that took place over lunch or in
10 terms of concerns that you might have so that
11 Southwestern Bell could take those into
12 consideration?
13 MR. SAUDER: Is this for all
14 billing PMS?
15 MS. NELSON: Yes.
16 MR. SAUDER: I'd like to -- T.J.
17 Sauder with Birch Telecom -- make a comment on
18 17.1. I think what we were getting at -- going
19 back and looking at historical data, we were
20 kind of getting away from what Birch -- what our
21 understanding of why we wanted the performance
22 measurement. It's getting away from actually
23 resolving the customer-affecting problems from
24 orders not posting in a timely manner. Going
25 off of historical data and setting the benchmark

Page 125

1 that way would only -- it would say that right
2 now is the -- whatever they're doing today is
3 good, and our experiences have shown, through
4 Docket 2100 and since going on from them, that
5 it needs improvement. We're looking for this
6 performance measurement to help us improve that
7 performance.

8 The customer impacts include double
9 billing and the CLEC's ability to service
10 customers. Since their systems don't update, we
11 can't service that customer until those orders
12 post. Also, I think in the thing that AT&T sent
13 out from Bell Atlantic, there is a three-day
14 posting performance measurement for Bell
15 Atlantic. So I just want to make sure I had
16 that on the record that we're interested in
17 implementing a performance measurement that
18 captures the customer-affecting problems so we
19 can have better performance going forward.

20 MS. NELSON: Right. And I think
21 staff is interested in knowing where you think
22 Southwestern Bell's -- where we have missed
23 setting the benchmark before or where the
24 historic performance does not provide CLECs with
25 parity or a meaningful opportunity to compete.

Page 126

1 I mean, because clearly that's the whole goal of
2 having the performance measures in the first
3 place.

4 MR. SAUDER: I guess our
5 suggestion, though, is that -- just going off of
6 historical data to date, where we have had
7 documented problems, not to use that as the
8 benchmark for days for --

9 MS. NELSON: I understand what
10 you're saying, but what I'm saying is if all we
11 have is historic data and you don't let us know
12 where there are problems and what the
13 appropriate benchmark should be, then we're
14 going to assume that either the current measure
15 is okay or the measurements set up that resulted
16 in the historic data is going to be okay.

17 MR. SAUDER: So you would like to
18 see --

19 MS. NELSON: So we'd need to
20 know --

21 MR. SAUDER: -- ongoing problems?

22 MS. NELSON: Yeah.

23 MR. SAUDER: Okay.

24 MS. NELSON: We need to know where
25 the benchmark needs to be changed. That's the

Page 127

1 whole purpose of the six-month review.

2 MR. WAKEFIELD: Your Honor, Jason
3 Wakefield, WorldCom. We have outlined, in
4 letters to the Commissioners, some of the
5 problems associated with late postings, and we
6 would propose a three-day benchmark simply
7 because the customer is without certain
8 functionalities between the time that the
9 service order confirmation goes in and the time
10 that the bill posting occurs.

11 MS. DILLARD: Well, this is Maria
12 Dillard. I think what's being discussed are
13 some issues that have been raised and that
14 Southwestern Bell has put some significant
15 process improvements on. You would see that in
16 our improvement over the last 12 months. I'm
17 not sure exactly what we mean by
18 "customer-affecting." If we're talking about
19 billing, it's the CLECs choice to bill off of
20 the post -- the posted service order versus the
21 completed service order. You are provided a
22 service order completion. All functionality for
23 the end user at that point is available and is
24 working. Service is working when you receive
25 the completion.

Page 128

1 MR. SAUDER: That date is the date
2 that you start billing the CLEC on, is the
3 bill -- is the day the service order completes.
4 The posting -- the issue is that when it posts,
5 that's when the Legacy system gets updated, and
6 CLECs can then begin to service their customers
7 if they want to have changes on their account or
8 services changes.

9 MS. DILLARD: Well, and I
10 understand that. I know this has been discussed
11 several times in the past, but for the most
12 part, there will always be a bill that is
13 rendered to the end user off the posted service
14 order from Southwestern Bell and -- and the CLEC
15 would be billing new. There will always be an
16 overlap, and that end user is always backdated
17 to credit them for any time frame that the
18 service order would have been posted. So
19 there's no -- even though it may look like an
20 overlap, there's always a credit that is
21 applied, because there's always an overlap, even
22 if it posts within the first day.

23 MR. SAUDER: We understand the
24 credit, and we understand that's going to
25 happen. But if orders post in a timely manner,